20959

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

CANADA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR..Sharon McIrvin Abu Laban.....

TITLE OF THESIS..Social Bonds in the Urban.......
Industrial Setting A Metasociological
Analysis..............................

UNIVERSITY...Alberta.................................

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED..Ph.D...............

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED....1974..........................

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed)..Sharon McIrvin Abu Laban

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

..2823 - 117 Street.....
..Edmonton..Alberta
....

DATED. April..23.........1974

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

SOCIAL BONDS IN THE URBAN INDUSTRIAL SETTING:
A METASOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

by

© SHARON MCIRVIN ABU-LABAN

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
SPRING, 1974

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Social Bonds in the Urban Industrial Setting: A Metasociological Analysis," submitted by Sharon McIrvin Abu-Laban in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Supervisor

External Examiner

Date. April 9, 1974

ABSTRACT

A frequent question in much of the sociological writing on urban industrial settings concerns the extent and/or nature of an imputed dimunition of supportive interpersonal ties. The purpose of this dissertation is to critically examine the tradition of sociological research on kin and extra-kin interpersonal ties in these settings. The study begins with an examination of the pertinent writings of three nineteenth century social thinkers, Ferdinand Tönnies, Emile Durkheim and Georg Simmel. These men are often assumed to have exerted a major influence on research of this genre. Nine relevant assumptions prevalent in the work of these writers are isolated. Following this, the pioneering studies by proponents of the American classicist approach are critically examined with a view to determining whether and to what extent the nine assumptions previously delineated are present. Next, the empirical challenge posed by the more recent relativist approach is critically examined, again with a view to determining the possible presence of the nine assumptions.

The results of this analysis show that several of the assumptions of the earlier European writers have carried on, largely untested, to succeeding generations of sociologists. It is suggested that the continued presence of these assumptions, sometimes in mutant form, has contributed to the state of empirical and theoretical indeterminancy in this area of inquiry.

This study identifies a number of issues which merit attention by sociologists. Among these are: (1) problems regarding conceptual handicaps; (2) insufficient attention to the relationship between patterns of social bonds and the life histories of individuals or families; (3) issues regarding cross-temporal and cross-cultural analyses; and (4) the need to focus on the development of empirical measures of the quality of interpersonal ties.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In the course of graduate training one receives, if fortunate, a supportive hand from others. I have been thus fortunate and would like to express my particular appreciation to several people.

My advisor, Dr. Charles Hobart, not only guided the dissertation research but generously gave time, interest and encouragement through several stages of my graduate work. I am very grateful for the benefits of both his scholarship and his friendship.

The time and help given by the members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Carlo Caldarola, Dr. Dhara Gill and Dr. A.S.A. Mohsen, have also been greatly appreciated. I am also grateful to Dr. Ernest A.T. Barth of the University of Washington for his contributions as external examiner. Several other professors have been particularly helpful at crucial junctures in my graduate work: Dr. Kazim Bacchus; Dr. A.K. Davis; Dr. James Hackler; Dr. Gordon Hirabayashi; Dr. George Kupfer and Dr. Gwynn Nettler.

My parents Ellsworth and Katherine McIrvin, my sister Janis McIrvin Anderson, my son Riyad and my daughter Yasmeen, each made a unique and important contribution to facilitating my student role.

To my husband, Dr. Baha Abu-Laban, I owe a special note of appreciation. He has encouraged me in my studies and shared with me the joys of intellectual inquiry. Throughout my graduate work I have been sustained by his continued encouragement and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE NATURE OF THE INVESTIGATION. 1

The Problem. 1

Background of Theory and Research. 1

1. The early intellectual heritage 1

2. The nineteenth century European tradition 3

3. Early American research 5

4. Recent empirical research 7

Purpose and Significance of the Study. 8

Steps in the Research Procedure. 10

Data and Limitations 11

Plan of the Thesis 12

II. THE CONTRIBUTION OF FERDINAND TÖNNIES. 14

Introduction 14

The Influence of the Intellectual Climate of the Nineteenth Century 15

Ferdinand Tönnies: Introduction 23

Two Types of Society: Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft . 24

Tönnies' Two Types of Will 27

Tönnies' View of the Family. 30

Tönnies' View of Non-Kin Relationships 33

The Impact of Industrialization. 34

The Impact of Urbanization 35

CHAPTER PAGE

Summary: Tönnies' View of "Traditional" and "Modern"
Social Relationships 36
Conclusions. 46
III. THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF DURKHEIM AND SIMMEL 50
Emile Durkheim: Introduction. 51
Pre-Modern and Modern Society. 52
Durkheim on the Family 54
Extra-Kin Relations. 56
Durkheim on the Division of Labor. 58
Durkheim on Urbanization 60
Summary: Durkheim's View of Pre-Modern and Modern
Social Relationships 62
Georg Simmel: Introduction. 71
Pre-Modern and Modern Society. 75
Simmel on the Family 77
Extra-Kin Relationships. 79
Simmel on the Division of Labor. 80
Simmel on Urbanization 81
Summary: Simmel's View of Traditional and Modern
Social Relationships 84
IV. TÖNNIES, DURKHEIM AND SIMMEL: SOME SHARED AND
DIVERGENT ASSUMPTIONS. 96
Introduction 96
Examination of the Assumptions 97
Concluding Remarks 103

CHAPTER PAGE

V. THE CLASSICIST APPROACH TO SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN URBAN INDUSTRIAL SETTINGS. 107

Introduction 107

The Classicist Approach and Extra-Kin Relationships. . 108

The Classicist Approach and Kinship Ties 134

Concluding Remarks 154

VI. THE CLASSICIST APPROACH AND ASSUMPTIONS OF THE EUROPEAN THEORISTS 159

Introduction 159

Concluding Observations. 177

VII. THE RELATIVIST APPROACH: A COMPARATIVE AND EMPIRICAL CHALLENGE. 181

Introduction 181

Cross-Cultural Challenges. 182

Intra-Cultural Challenges. 190

The Relativist Approach and Earlier Assumptions. . . . 202

Concluding Remarks 214

VIII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS 218

Introduction 218

New Concepts 220

Aspects of Life History. 222

Cross-Cultural and Cross-Temporal Research 224

Quality of Relationships 228

A Concluding Observation 230

PAGE

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 234

APPENDIX A - PROBLEMS IN THE USE OF POLAR TYPE CONSTRUCTS . . 267

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1 Tönnies: Characteristics of "Traditional" and "Modern" Social Relationships. 38

2 Tönnies: Sources of Emotional Support in "Traditional" and "Modern" Societies 40

3 Tönnies: "Traditional" and "Modern" Family Characteristics and Their Contribution to Interpersonal Life. 42

4 Tönnies: Summary of Major Influences on Interpersonal Relationships and Evaluation of Their Contributions to the Quality of a Relationship. 43

5 Durkheim: Characteristics of Traditional and Modern Social Relationships 66

6 Durkheim: Sources of Emotional Support in Traditional and Modern Societies 67

7 Durkheim: Traditional and Modern Family Characteristics and Their Contribution to Interpersonal Life 69

8 Durkheim: Summary of Major Influences on Interpersonal Relationships and Evaluation of Their Contributions to the Quality of a Relationship. 70

9 Simmel: Characteristics of Traditional and Modern Social Relationships 86

10 Simmel: Sources of Emotional Support in Traditional and Modern Societies 87

11 Simmel: Traditional and Modern Family Characteristics and Their Contribution to Interpersonal Life 89

12 Simmel: Summary of Major Influences on Interpersonal Relationships and Evaluation of Their Contributions to a Relationship. 90

13 Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel: Comparison of Shared and Divergent Assumptions. 104

CHAPTER ONE

THE NATURE OF THE INVESTIGATION

THE PROBLEM

The focus of this study is on sociological theorizing and research regarding social bonds in the urban industrial setting. The relatively short history of modern sociology reflects a continuing interest in and concern about the impact of urbanization and industrialization on the quality of interpersonal relationships and the nature and strength of family ties. There is considerable disagreement in the literature regarding the characteristics of both kin and extra-kin support ties in complex societies. The issues involved can be readily traced to the formal beginnings of the discipline of sociology in the nineteenth century. The purpose of this study is to examine the work of specific, influential nineteenth century social thinkers to determine common assumptions which not only characterized their work but may have carried over into the more recent research in the field. It is suggested that the resolution of current controversies regarding the nature of modern social bonds may have been impeded by the continuing ramifications of these earlier assumptions.

BACKGROUND OF THEORY AND RESEARCH

1. The early intellectual heritage

Much has been written about the effects of urbanization and industrialization on the quality of interpersonal relationships (e.g., Tönnies, 1957; Durkheim, 1951; Parsons, 1943; Linton, 1959; Israel, 1971).

The urban-industrial setting has frequently been seen as characterized by attenuated interpersonal relationships. Both kin and non-kin support ties have been seen as diminished. In distinct contrast to this, pre-urban, pre-industrialized societies have often been portrayed as fulfilling or having fulfilled human needs for supportive and meaningful relationships with others. Both family and extra-familial ties have been pictured as qualitatively different from those characterizing the urban industrialized setting.

Dichotomous portrayals of the virtues of rural life and the vices of urban life obviously have a long history predating the field of sociology. The Old Testament prophets often attacked the cities of their day for their corruption and urged a return to the simple pastoral life (Chamberline and Feldman, 1950). One of the most common allusions within the Judaic-Christian written heritage is to the wickedness of the cities of Sodom and Gommorrah and their fiery destruction. Throughout the Old Testament there are many denunciations of the ways of urban people.[1]

Evidence of similar comparisons comes from fifth century Greece. A pamphleteer known as Old Oligarch suggests that the urbanites of Athens were regarded by Greek country people as "morally loose and untrustworthy" and lacking in "stamina, endurance (and) manliness" (Brinton, 1959:86).

In a similar vein, in the fourteenth century, the Arab scholar Ibn Khaldun contrasted nomadic and sedentary societies. The nomadic society was seen as providing solidarity (asabiyah) and the sedentary was seen as leading to moral weakness and lack of supportive ties. These two types bear close resemblance to several societal typologies developed in the nineteenth century, such as Tönnies' Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft, Durkheim's mechanical-organic solidarity and other constructs which distinguish between past versus present, simple versus complex or rural versus urban societies.

Contrasts between the supposedly positive aspects of rural life and the supposedly negative aspects of urban life are also part of our literary heritage, typified, for example, in the work of Emerson, Thoreau, Hawthorne and Poe (Marx, 1964; White and White, 1964). For many of these writers (as with typologists of the nineteenth century), the virtues of the bucolic life additionally presented an escape from an additional "evil" of more recent origin, i.e., industrialization. In literary terms the idealization of rural life is referred to as pastoralism. The present study suggests that variants of pastoralist themes may also run through and color the sociological attempts to examine the nature of social bonds in contemporary society.

2. The nineteenth century European tradition

Maine, Comte, Fustel de Coulanges, Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel, among other social thinkers of the nineteenth century, all point to the negative effects on social bonding of movement from traditional agrarian based societies to modern industrial societies. These writers expressed concern about the relationships which they saw between increasing societal differentiation and decreasing supportive social bonds. Their "rediscovery" of the importance of community has been characterized by Nisbet (1966:47) as "the most distinctive development in nineteenth century social thought." The community with which these writers were concerned referred not to a narrow geographical area but to a climate of relationships involving high intensity, commitment and continuity. The archetype of this sense of community has traditionally been the family and, accordingly, these nineteenth century writers also saw a decline in traditional supports of the family.

Nineteenth century European social thought was most influential on the early development of sociology in North America. The work of three key social theorists, in particular, is felt to have had major impact on research on urban industrial social bonds. These three theorists are Ferdinand Tönnies, Emile Durkheim and Georg Simmel.

Tönnies is recognized as a major figure in this area. His dichotomous societal types, Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, have been cited as having had major influence on all following typologies of this genre (Martindale, 1960:86). Likewise, Emile Durkheim is a nineteenth century writer who has strongly influenced American sociology. His early concerns with societal integration and social control, the decline of the family and the need for substitute supports are familiar to most sociologists. Durkheim also proposed two societal types, one based upon mechanical solidarity and the other based upon organic solidarity. Georg Simmel's influence is not as widely recognized and his work has not been available in translation until fairly recently. However, several early American sociologists who studied in Europe came under his influence. Simmel's article, "The Metropolis and Mental Life," was a particularly influential statement on urban personality and urban life style. Simmel was a major influence on the Chicago school of urban research.

3. Early American research

European social thinkers exerted a major influence on the development of American sociology. However, the research tradition dealing with interpersonal ties in urban industrial settings has frequently fallen into two categories of specialization: one dealing with the study of the family and the other dealing with community or extra-familial ties (Adams, 1968). The early American research from the 1920's to late 1940's was strongly influenced by the Chicago school of urban research.

The works of Louis Wirth, Robert Park, Ernest Burgess and the "Chicago school" appear to have continued the nineteenth century European theme of modern estrangement from interpersonal kin and extra-kin relationships. Wirth's work emphasized the predominance of secondary groups in urban society. Wirth (1938) saw urbanism as a "way of life" characterized by the "relative absence of intimate, personal acquaintanceship" and the "segmentalization of human relations which are largely anonymous, superficial and transitory." Park noted that (Stein, 1960:44) "We don't ever really get to know the urbane person and hence never know when to trust him." Although Park acknowledged that the city provided "freedom," it was freedom both for the "eccentric genius" and the "destructive criminal."

Similarly, Burgess (1948) saw family instability as characteristic of urban areas, following the general assumption that urban areas are inimical to the maintenance of primary ties. The perceived breakdown of primary ties, both kin and non-kin, was seen as being accompanied by the apparent demise of social control. Following this premise, many of the landmark studies which came out of the University of Chicago during this era focused on the social problems of the city. Such social problems, whether involving delinquent gangs, hoboes, or taxi dance halls, were seen as indicators of the attenuated primary support (and hence control) mechanism of urban society.

The Chicago monographs on urban life and the research of many family sociologists during this period seem to have continued the earlier themes of the nineteenth century regarding the decreasing influence and support of the family. Burgess (1945), Linton (1949), Parsons (1942, 1943, 1955, 1965), and Ogburn (1928, 1933), to mention only a few notable writers, all pointed to the general diminishing of kinship ties in urban industrial society. Parsons proposed and popularized the phrase the "isolated nuclear family." Although it does not represent a departure from already existing themes regarding the modern family, Parson's concept has been frequently cited and his arguments used as a base by supporters of the general classical position.[2] Within this approach, the perceived decline in the extended family is viewed as connected with the rise in industrialization. Industrialization, with its emphasis on geographic mobility, social mobility and achievement over ascription, is congenial with the nuclear family system but not with the extended. Indeed, in their enthusiasm to cite industrialization as an independent variable, some writers seem to attach to the process an almost omnipotent power to affect the structure of family and community relations.[3]

The picture drawn by the earlier research in urban sociology and the family was of modern humankind living in a situation of decreased and generally less rewarding interpersonal relationships — both familial and extra-familial.

4. Recent empirical research

More recent research on urban social bonding has suggested the inadequacies of the view of urbanism as a "way of life" bereft of "meaningful" relationships. Several studies have appeared which refuted this blanket characterization and indicated the existence of urban non-kin primary ties (cf., Greer and Kube, 1959; Greer, 1962; Gans, 1962). Extra-kin primary contacts have been found to vary with ethnicity (Gans, 1962; Winch and Blumberg, 1968), life style (Greer and Kube, 1959; Leibow, 1967; Michelson, 1970), social class (Gans, 1962; Greer, 1962) and stage in the life cycle (Rosow, 1967; Michelson, 1970).

Similarly, recent empirical findings have questioned the extent to which the western world has actually abandoned the extended family (Sussman, 1953, 1959; Garigue, 1956; Litwak, 1959, 1960a, 1960b; Townsend, 1963; Irving, 1972). Sussman and Burchinal (1962) have summarized a series of studies showing that the rigid characterization of the isolated nuclear family in the west is subject to modifications. Lower class families in urban areas, for example, have been shown to have frequent visits with kin and to provide emotional and financial support to their members. At all class levels, when there is geographical separation there tends to be kin support via gifts, aid in crises, and provision of temporary housing for visiting relatives. Research evidence thus suggests that the isolation of the nuclear family tends to be influenced by region, ethnicity, class and sex (Bott, 1957; Adams, 1970; Irving, 1971). Sussman and Burchinal concur with Litwak (1959) on the existence of a "modified extended family." They further suggest that in North America "the role of the family kin network is supportive rather than coercive in its relationship with the nuclear family" (Sussman and Burchinal, 1962:252).[4]

However, support can be and still is being found for at least portions of the classical position. The weight of the evidence is heavily dependent on the definition of "isolated" in the isolated nuclear family hypothesis (Parsons, 1965; Winch, 1968), and the definition of "extended" in the term extended family (see Gibson, 1972). In addition, some of the more recent research suggests the paucity of primary support ties in urban areas (Guterman, 1969; Wellman *et al.*, 1971).

PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

In brief, the present study proposes the following:

(1) A critical examination of the relevant works of Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel, in the belief that these works have had a substantial influence on the study of urban industrial social bonds. The object of this examination is to determine common and divergent assumptions among these three social thinkers regarding the study of urban industrial social bonds, and evaluate the empirical basis of these assumptions.

(2) A critical examination of early American research on kin and extra-kin interpersonal ties in the urban industrial setting. The object of this examination is to determine whether and to what extent assumptions held by the three European theorists have carried over into early American research on the subject, and evaluate any new empirical basis for these assumptions.

(3) A critical examination of more recent research on urban industrial social bonds. Again, the object of this examination is to determine whether and to what extent assumptions embedded in the work of European theorists are still prevalent in contemporary research, and evaluate the existing empirical basis for these assumptions.

The focus on the relevant works of Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel as a starting point for the analysis is consistent with the observation made by the noted philosopher of science, Gustave Bergman (1966:8):

> If the facts are either insecure or not yet organized by theory, it may be useful to know which facts stirred the imaginations of one's predecessors. If there is as yet no theory or not much of one, the concepts with which others tried to build theories in the past may be suggestive. Thus progress may be facilitated or, at least, waste may be avoided by a knowledge of history.

The significance of this study derives from the attempt to provide a more thorough and systematic analysis of major European contributions to the study of social bonds in urban industrial settings. In particular, identification and assessment of assumptions embedded in the works of early European theorists may facilitate a more thorough evaluation of early and more recent research on interpersonal ties in complex societies. On the basis of findings from this analysis, the study may suggest possible avenues for transcending the constricting influence, if any, of unwarranted assumptions and deficient research practices in the study of urban industrial social bonds. Moreover, the study may provide new insights regarding practical interpretations of the quality of interpersonal relationships in the urban industrial environment.

STEPS IN THE RESEARCH PROCEDURE

The steps in the research procedure are as follows:

(1) An exploration of the themes, commonalities and some basic assumptions in the works of Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel on urban industrial social bonds. We will be interested in the social traits which each theorist specifies as characteristic of "traditional" and "modern" societies, the sources of socio-emotional supports which they see as characteristically available in traditional and modern societies, and their treatment of kinship and kin extension. Additionally, we will consolidate those features of interpersonal relationships which each theorist, probably more by implication than explication, assumes to have a major impact on the quality of social relationships.

(2) Delineation of some assumptions held in common by these three European forefathers. These assumptions will then be examined with reference to more recent approaches to the question at issue.

(3) An examination of major work in urban sociology, particularly of the Chicago school, dealing with societal complexity and interpersonal ties, during the period from the 1920's to the late 1940;s. Following this, we will examine the more recent cross-cultural and historical evidence which questions the validity of the earlier conclusions that urban life is characterized by attenuated primary ties.

(4) An examination of major works which attempt to specify the nature and extent of urban-industrial kinship ties. This will include examination of early and more recent research on urban-industrial family ties.

(5) An examination of the extent to which the previously delineated

assumptions common to our nineteenth century predecessors may have colored and may continue to color the research efforts regarding the nature of urban industrial interpersonal relationships.

DATA AND LIMITATIONS

The rationale for selection of specific sources for each theorist, or for each research approach, will be spelled out in each chapter. We would like to note, however, that the data and the conclusions drawn from these data are based on primary sources. Where translated sources are used (e.g., for Durkheim, Tönnies and Simmel), it must be acknowledged that one is dependent upon the integrity of the translator. Given the time lapse between the publication of these early European works and the present, even current translations face the problem of the meaning of words in their temporal context (in this case some seventy to eighty years ago). To minimize difficulties arising from this issue, a careful attempt has been made to support all interpretative comments with citations so the reader may easily cross-check interpretations. The influence traced is that of three men, Tönnies, Simmel and Durkheim. Hence, the work is limited by this. The works pertaining to the classicist and relativist approaches to urban industrial social bonds were selected with a view to giving an overview of the approach involved. In the classicist approach, the focus was more on the works of individually prominent writers. The relativist approach is less characterized by the work of individuals than by a genre of research designed to qualify the classical approach.

PLAN OF THE THESIS

The chapter following examines the contributions of Ferdinand Tönnies and relevant aspects of the nineteenth century intellectual climate in which he worked. The third chapter consists of an analysis of the pertinent writings of Emile Durkheim and Georg Simmel. Chapter Four delineates and discusses nine assumptions common to the works of the European theorists. Chapter Five discusses the classical approach to urban industrial social bonds as represented by work in urban sociology and sociology of the family, while Chapter Six examines this approach in light of the nine assumptions earlier discussed in the work of the European theorists. The challenge to the classical approach as embodied in the empirical research of the relativist approach, will be examined in Chapter Seven. The final chapter closes with a discussion of the implications and conclusions of this study.

CHAPTER ONE

FOOTNOTES

1. See, for example, the so-called "ethical" prophets, Amos, Hosea and Isaiah.

2. Parsons' (1965) recent clarification of his argument in light of criticisms shows little change in his position.

3. The family is usually viewed as a dependent variable. Zimmerman (1947) is one early exception here. Likewise development economists often cite the kinship system in non-industrial societies as an independent variable influencing the prospects of industrialization by its definitions of individual mobility (Nye and Berardo, 1966).

4. Implicit in this example of optimistic xenophobia is a contrast with traditional extended families in the non-western world. However, Adams' (1968) findings in Greensboro, North Carolina indicate that a sense of obligation weighs very heavily on adults' contact with their parents.

CHAPTER TWO

THE CONTRIBUTION OF FERDINAND TÖNNIES

INTRODUCTION

Speculation and concern about the nature of modern social bonds were common in the middle and late nineteenth century - the formative period of modern sociology. The work of some writers, however, stands out as significantly influential for the later development of the field. These sociological "forefathers" almost routinely acknowledged in the prefatory passages of professional publications set a climate of thought in their time which may still be reflected in the assumptions operating in current studies of the interplay between societal types and social relationships.

As detailed in chapter one, three social thinkers, Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel, appear to have been of major influence on early and later analyses in this area, hence their contributions will be examined in detail. Their typologies and assumptions regarding variables having impact on the quality of social bonds will be compared and later examined in relation to specific controversies in this area. This second chapter will focus on the contributions of Ferdinand Tönnies, whose Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft typology pre-dated the work of both Durkheim and Simmel and influenced them as well as later writers.

Tönnies' Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft, which was first published in 1887, can serve as an example of the potential reward in recombining established patterns of thought. Tönnies' work is, in many respects, characteristic of the scholarly climate of his time. Reference to parallel ideas coexisting within the general intellectual climate of this period is meant neither to detract from Tönnies' work nor to pinpoint some causal sequence purporting to lead to his own famed typology. The fact remains, however, that Tönnies' work articulates well with the broader European intellectual milieu. An overview of the intellectual heritage and its accompanying social climate will serve to specify those aspects of nineteenth century social thought which appear to have influenced Tönnies' first and major work.[1]

THE INFLUENCE OF THE INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Many scholarly works, now regarded as landmarks in the development of the field of sociology, made their appearance in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Our focus is on work relating to Tönnies' societal dichotomy, hence the particularized summary which follows will be, of necessity, only a surface skimming of an important period in the history of ideas. However, a feeling for the patterns of thought and their intermeshing with the patterns of events during this period serves a dual purpose: it provides a background for examining Tönnies' work and, in addition, it provides a launching point for examining the cultural/historical blinders which may have operated on these crucial nineteenth century studies and which may still be in evidence today.

The intellectual climate of nineteenth century Europe was one tempered by the fires of two revolutions in France and the pervasive, if somewhat helpless, recognition of the awesome impact of the Industiral Revolution. Negative concomitants of industrialization could be observed in abundance by the social critics of this period. These were manifest in such forms as long hours of work at low pay, dangerous working conditions, child labor, congested cities with inadequate housing and attendant social problems. The potential instability of the political order was emphasized by more than just the demise of the divine right of kings, for it was characterized by unstable citizens' governments. For many of the European intellegentsia the social order seemed quite tenuous. Intellectual circles were not infrequently characterized by political conservatism and a pervasive longing for the status quo ante. It was in this milieu that the new discipline of sociology was nurtured.

Several writers constructed societal types in an attempt to explain the transformations perceived to be taking place in European society and to extrapolate from the indicators around them some forecasts concerning society of the future. These were often antithetical societal types. Such dualistic distinctions are part of a broader tradition based on philosophical-religious thought. Ossowski (1963:19 ff), citing religious works as early forerunners, noted the tradition of dualism in characterizing the social structure of society (e.g., the blessed versus the accursed, the top versus the bottom, the rich versus the poor, the rulers versus the ruled). These dualisms carry with them an implicit, if not explicit, distinction between the right and the wrong, the good and the evil. In a similar way, societal typologies have often carried evaluative overtones. Although observers have noted man's predilection for the numbers three and five in analytic thought, the attraction for the number two may be of even greater antiquity. Certainly, as will be seen, the tradition of polar distinctions was both prevalent and influential in middle and late nineteenth century Europe.

The technological and scientific advances of the period stimulated the transformation of methods of social inquiry. The empirical method of positivism gained increasing support. As a technique for interpreting societal change, positivism together with stirrings of evolutionism which had pre-dated Darwin's work, formed an appealing combination.[2] Thus, evolutionism/developmentalism is reflected in much of the work to be discussed.

A major figure contributing to the convergence of ideas discussed above was, of course, August Comte (1798-1857). Although given the persistent curiosity and ingenuity of humankind, it is hazardous to pinpoint the origin of any field of knowledge, August Comte often bears the label of "father" of sociology.[3] Comte was one of those writers shaken by the apparent ramifications of the revolutions in France. His attempt to interpret societal change rested on his famous "law of three stages." Societal development, the development of individuals and the development of each field of knowledge pass through three stages, the theological, the metaphysical and the positivistic. Within this hierarchical ordering, Europe was close to the quintessential apex of positivism, the understanding of society based upon scientific observables. Comte constructed a trilogy of societal types moving from the military to the legalistic to the industrial. Using organismic analogies, Comte saw population density in the industrial society resulting in increased differentiation of interest, promoting division among people and thus increasing societal conflict. However, sociology as the positivistic study of social phenomena would be a "new religion" which would integrate modern industrial society and provide *consensus universalis*. Comte, of course, had considerable impact within the intellectual circles of Europe.

One of the important writers of this period who used dichotomous types to explain societal transformations was the English jurist and historian, Henry Sumner Maine (1822-1888). Maine's *Ancient Law*, published in 1861, depicted communities developing from status (based on ascription) to contract (based on achievement). Maine saw contract as "the tie between man and man which replaces by degrees those forms of reciprocity in rights and duties which have their origin in the Family" (Maine, 1885:139). Maine attempted to provide an explanatory base for understanding modern legal concepts by examining societal types. Writing on societal change Maine noted:

> The movement of the progressive societies has been uniform in one respect. Through all its course it has been distinguished by the gradual dissolution of family dependency and the growth of individual obligation in its place. The individual is steadily substituted for the family as the unit of which civil laws take account (Maine, 1885:138).

Maine's analysis contrasted Eastern European, Indian, Chinese and western European societies. As an example of the pattern of change which he saw as important, Maine noted that in ancient Roman society the oldest male enjoyed complete domination over his sons, slaves and wives. The decline of family authority (i.e., the authority of the eldest male) was reflected in Roman legal developments. Once sons were freed from loyalty to their father and transferred this loyalty to the state, the status of the individual moved away from the family unit. Thus the way was paved for a society based upon contract. Although the status-contract typology was posited as a device for examining modern law, its applicability extended beyond this to the movement of individuals from status in the family to contract in the state.

In contrast to Maine's emphasis on the law, the French historian Numa-Denys Fustel de Coulanges (1830-1889) stressed the role of religion. Fustel, who was an influential professor of Emile Durkheim's (Nisbet, 1966:238) stressed the role of religion in examining societal change. Fustel's book The Ancient City, published in 1864, made an analytic distinction between sacred and secular societies similar to Maine's distinction between status versus contract. Using the ancient Greek and Roman City-states as points for comparison, Fustel saw a dichotomy between traditional societies which were close knit, family oriented and religiously based, and modern societies based upon secularism and rationality. Ancient families were principally united, according to Fustel, not by bonds of common affection but by a common religion which brought together not only the current generations but also their ancestors into one unit of awareness. Religion provided the base both for paternal authority and the governing autonomy of family units. In contrast, modern society, with its rise of political empires and broad extension of citizenship, brought with it the decline of religious superiority and the secularization and individualization of society.

Similarly, the German jurist, Otto von Gierke (1841-1921) began publishing his study Das Deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht in 1868 and this continued for several decades. In this work von Gierke contrasted the medieval community based on ascription, and in view of the law, the organic integrity of communal and corporate groups, and modern society with its individualism and centralization of political power. Nisbet (1966) sees Maine, Fustel, and von Gierke, in fact, as the three major influences on Tönnies' work. However, it was, as mentioned, a period rich in ideas. Many writers were concerned with societal transformations and their interpretations often overlapped with one another.

The work of the English writer, Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), was a pervasive presence in the second half of the nineteenth century. He is particularly remembered now for his evolutionary *laissez-fai*[illegible] attitudes which were a prelude to the rise of Social Darwinism and of delight to industrialists of his time. However, his total approach encompassed a positivistic organicist view of an evolving society. His first significant work, *Social Statics*, was published in 1850. Spencer classified societies in either of two ways — in terms of their composition (i.e., their evolution from simple to compound to doubly compound) or in terms of the dominance of some kind of system. Using Comtian terminology, Spencer saw societies evolving from basically military societies (characterized by compulsory cooperation) to industrial societies (characterized by voluntary cooperation). The military-based society of the past emphasized issues of war and peace, had strong centralized control under a power hierarchy and subordinated the individual to a life of discipline. In contrast, in the industrial society there is emphasis on trade and commerce. Greater freedom is allowed and cooperation is voluntary. The nature of cooperation was of central consideration in Spencer's analysis of societies. Interpersonal relations may be characterized by some degree of voluntary cooperation. The increasing division of labor was cited as of crucial significance.

However, Spencer parted company with Comte in his view that the division of labor fostered increasing interdependence. In Spencer's view simpler societies composed of homogeneous units were fragilely bound together under some form of authority. In contrast modern societies would be more closely knit than simpler societies because of interdependence. The family was seen by Spencer as having evolved from a primitive state of promiscuity to polyandry, polygyny and then monogamy. It has shifted from a weak link in the primitive state to its present condition where maximum individual freedom is allowed within a conciliation of the needs of different generations.

Various writers sought an antidote to the rampant individualism of modern society. For Spencer the answer was the spread of education, for **Comte** the answer was positivism, while for Karl Marx it was the abolition of private property. Marx's work, as well as that of other socialist thinkers, was known to scholars in the late nineteenth century. However, Marx's theories had, for a long time, according to Bottomore and Rubel (1956:26), been "isolated from the social sciences as they were being developed in Universities. Their sociological relevance only began to be realized toward the end of the nineteenth century." Certainly Tönnies was aware and to some extent was instrumental in the resurgence of interest in Marxism (Tönnies, 1957; Bottomore and Rubel, 1956).

It is important, in attempting to understand the relevant aspects of the late nineteenth century intellectual climate, to realize that many of Marx's works had not even been published then. For example, his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844, perhaps his most sensitive statement on alienation, was not available to readers until its discovery in the 1920s and subsequent publication in 1930. Even then, with the demise of German Sociology, this work was not fully studied until after the Second World War (Bottomore and Rubel, 1956:46).

While we will by-pass what have become ideologically laden debates concerning the validity of the distinction between the young Marx and the mature Marx, it should be borne in mind that many of the early writings of Marx's youth were not available until the twentieth century. Those aspects of Marx's view of the role of the division of labor which were widely known in the nineteenth century are the ones germane to our discussion. Briefly, Marx felt that the economic foundation of society exerted tremendous influence on all of its sectors. Those who controlled economic production had, therefore, widespread influence and power. The most simple societies were classless but with the division of labor came social cleavages. In both feudalism and capitalism conflict was inevitable as the sub-units of the society jostled for control of economic resources. Class conflict between the owners of the means of production and the workers in capitalist society was to be expected. Workers in such societies were exploited and increasingly impoverished. Man was misshapen by the "fetishism of commodities." However all of this Marx saw as only a necessary phase in the eventual transformation of society. The problems of capitalism were transient and were innate not to industrialism but to the ephemeral bourgeois society. Marx prophesized the coming of the proletarian revolution and a better future as a temporary dictatorship of the proletariat re-organized the economic structure of the society, re-educated the people and paved the way for the eventual and total communism of the classless society.

This brief overview of the contributions of Comte, Maine, Fustel de Coulanges, von Gierke, Spencer and Marx gives an indication of the broad concern with change from traditional to modern society in the nineteenth century. Societal types were a common analytical device among these writers. There was an awareness of the decreased influence of the family and a concern with issues of solidarity and social control. There was also a widespread concern about the social meaning of the division of labor and the Industrial Revolution. It was within this context that Tönnies' Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft was created.

FERDINAND TÖNNIES: INTRODUCTION

Ferdinand Tönnies' (1855-1936) classic treatise, Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft was first published in 1887 and first translated into English in 1940. In this work, Tönnies first proposed his classic societal types of the same name. It was originally read by only a small circle of admirers, but in its second (some fifteen years later) and subsequent editions it increasingly attracted a wider following.

Though Tönnies was an active, wide ranging writer throughout his life, it is this particular work, written at the age of 32, which received the most attention and has had the greatest impact on the development of Sociology. Martindale (1960:86) asserts that "all modern societal typologies — such as Durkheim's distinction between 'mechanical' and 'organic' solidarity, Park's 'sacred-secular' distinction, Redfield's 'folk-secular' distinction — take Tönnies' conceptualizations as a starting point." Hence, it is appropriate to start our examination of social bonding in the urban industrial setting with the work of Tönnies. Our concern here is not with the progressive development of Tönnies' thought over the fifty year period from the publication of the above book until the time of his death. Instead, the focus will be on the original Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft typology as elaborated in his influential book. Thereafter, we will examine the subsequent transformations of these ideas by writers following Tönnies.[4]

TWO TYPES OF SOCIETY: GEMEINSCHAFT AND GESELLSCHAFT[5]

The polar types proposed by Tönnies and used throughout his writings have been translated as community (Gemeinschaft) and society (Gesellschaft) (Loomis, 1957). This is somewhat misleading. Although the translation of Gemeinschaft as community (symbolizing a climate of supportive relationships) is fairly accurate, Gesellschaft is also meant to refer to a type of relationship and the English word society does not convey this. The Gesellschaft relationship is one of self-interest, individualism and impersonality.

Tönnies characterized Gesellschaft as a negation — an artificial creation that encompasses the characteristics of community only in the sense that people are living in the same area. In Gesellschaft, in spite of factors which should unite, the people are divided and they lack collective spirit. In Tönnies' words,

> . . . here everybody is by himself, and isolated, and there exists a condition of tension against all others. Their spheres of activity and power are sharply separated, so that everybody refuses to everyone else contact with and admittance to his sphere, i.e., intrusions are regarded as hostile acts (Tonnies, 1957:65).

In sharp contrast, in Gemeinschaft people are united, bound together by consensus – the reciprocity of common understanding.

A crucial yet often neglected aspect of Tönnies' work is that, although historical societies are seen as reflecting a movement from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft, Tönnies sees these two societal types as being able to co-exist for at least a transitional period (Tönnies 1957:227) and to exist in multi-faceted forms. Tönnies notes that both Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft societies can take the form of either union or association. Clarification of these translated terms is necessary. The term union,(Vergindung) as used by Tönnies, refers to a close unity, while the term association (Bundnis) refers to a loose relationship (Nisbet, 1966).

Gemeinschaft society takes the form of union first and then of association. Still a different form of association is manifest in the Gesellschaft society. The Gesellschaft society has the possibility of moving from association into a form of union. The progressive movement from union of Gemeinschaft, to association of Gemeinschaft and then to association of Gesellschaft represents a spreading stain of triumph for egoism, individuality and rationality in relationships. However, following this there is the possibility of a fourth phase which involves a recovery of Gemeinschaft.

The archetype of the initial phase, the union of Gemeinschaft, is the family. The next phase, the secondary form of Gemeinschaft or associations of Gemeinschaft is represented by friendship, "community of spirit and mind based on common work or calling and thus on common beliefs" (Tönnies, 1957:191). Such associations are also found in federations of churches, arts and crafts and, in general, social contexts where the "idea" of family is maintained. Tönnies sees marriage as a relationship in between a union and an association of Gemeinschaft. It is consanguinity which has a primordial lure in Tönnies' view of interpersonal relationships.

Following associations of Gemeinschaft are associations of Gesellschaft. These are formed for defined purposes and call for united effort. The association of Gesellschaft is distinguished by the characteristic that:

> . . .all its activities are restricted to a defined end and a definite means of attaining it, if it is to be valid, i.e., to conform to the will of its members. (In contrast, it is the essential characteristic of association of the Gemeinschaft to be as universal as life itself and to derive their forces not from outside but from within) (Tönnies, 1957:194).

One may say that the difference appears to lie in organizations organized for basically instrumental ends and organizations organized for basically expressive ends.

Though the Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft distinction parallels traditional and modern societies, Tönnies did not view the movement from the earlier form to the more recent form as irrevocable. Within the Gesellschaft society there is the possibility of antipodal movements. In an addendum to the 1912 edition of his book, he noted that the then newly forming cooperative movement represents a form of Gemeinschaft economy which may expand. Tönnies, additionally, allowed for the possibility (though admittedly not the probability) of government intervention. It is difficult, however, to imagine the Gesellschaft State voluntarily destroying the Gesellschaft society (Tönnies, 1957:230). However, class consciousness, struggle and revolution were seen by

Tönnies as possibilities which would bring forth the destruction of the Gesellschaft state and the Gesellschaft society.

The impression has sometimes been given by subsequent writers that Tönnies viewed the movement from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft as irreversible and total (see, for example, Sorokin, 1928:492). This is quite misleading. In his 1912 addendum, Tönnies claimed, in fact, an increasing societal awareness of the need to resurrect Gemeinschaft qualities. The revival of Gemeinschaft "may become the focus for a resuscitation of family life and other forms of Gemeinschaft" because of a broader awareness of its importance and contributions (Tönnies, 1957:196).[6]

TÖNNIES' TWO TYPES OF WILL

Tönnies attempted to link the psychological with the sociological by emphasizing that two types of will underlie the Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft distinction. This volitional aspect of his theory is another important but not infrequently by-passed aspect of his total argument. Tönnies particularly emphasized the connection between the two societal types and the two types of will in a note appended to the 1911 edition of his book. The two major types of will seen by Tönnies were wesenwill (translated as natural will) and kurwille (translated as rational will). These were seen as causes or tendencies toward action. Natural will arises out of commitment to group tradition (beliefs and sentiments) and is concomitant with Gemeinschaft relationships. In contrast, rational will arises out of expediency, a means-end orientation and is concomitant with Gesellschaft relationships. Though natural will involves thought, rational will was seen as the *product* of thought. Using terminology of the present-day, one may describe rational will as calculating or instrumental and natural will as spontaneous and expressive. Tönnies described the temperament of natural will as "fluid, soft and warm," in contrast rational will was characterized as "dry, hard and cold" (1957:143). Using similarly evaluative terminology, he described rural and domestic pursuits as warm, soft labour (1957:164). As would be expected, rural and domestic pursuits were seen as characteristic of those with natural will.

Tönnies associated these two types of will with specific categories of people, what might be termed as essentially the categories of the powerless (the calculated upon) versus the powerful (the calculators). Thus he saw women, the young and commoners as susceptible to natural will – the will characteristic of Gemeinschaft. Because of this they are also likely to be exploited by the possessors of rational will, such as men, the aged and the educated classes.

Tönnies thus characterized natural will as feminine emotionalism and rational will as masculine logic. Although Tönnies viewed increasing emancipation of women as leading to their possession of rational will, it was clearly, in his eyes, against their "nature." It is interesting, however, that Tönnies, pre-dating today's proponents of liberation from stereotyped sex roles, saw the man of *genius* as manifesting both types of will: the natural will, characteristic of women, and the rational will, characteristic of men. This observation also has interesting implications for his use of ideal types which will be discussed later.

Society and social relationships were seen as the products of one or the other of these two types of human will. However, Tönnies attempted to make it clear that he viewed these two types of volition as ideal types.

> Between these two extremes (natural and rational will) real volition takes place. The consideration that most volition and action resembles or is inclined toward either one or the other makes it possible to establish the concepts of natural will and rational will, which concepts are rightly applied only in this sense. I call them normal concepts. What they represent are ideal types, and they serve as standards by which reality may be recognized and described (1957:248).

Tönnies (1957:141) further noted that these two forms of will could co-exist and cautioned that "no natural will can ever occur empirically without rational will by which it finds expression, and no rational will without natural will on which it is based, . . ." however, there are ". . .empirical tendencies toward the one or the other."

Although Tönnies referred to the two forms of will as ideal types, observations such as the one previously mentioned, regarding the possession by men of genius of the will types of both sexes reflect some of the problems in his use of ideal types. Tönnies wrote in most places as if these types were distinct realities - particularly when implying, for example, that men in general do not possess natural will and only unique men (i.e., geniuses) possess the two forms of will. Instead of perhaps specifying the existence of ratios of the two will forms, he wrote as though these dichotomies were polar realities. Whatever the degree of clarity in his own thought on this issue, the continuum aspect of his argument has tended to become lost in most English discussion of this work.

In addition to using emotionally charged adjectives such as warm, soft and fluid to describe natural will, Tönnies seemed to attach an almost mystic quality to the motivations underlying natural will. For example, he reflected on it as an apparent "givingness" without expectation of recompense. In sharp contrast, in Gesellschaft-like relations rational will predominates and "nobody wants to grant and produce anything for another individual. . .if it be not in exchange for a gift or labor equivalent that he considers at least equal to what he has given" (1957:65). This observation seems to reveal not only a romanticization of Gemeinschaft, but a lack of awareness of the tangled web of reciprocity which develops within rural, pre-industrialized societies (e.g., Foster, 1967).

TÖNNIES' VIEW OF THE FAMILY

Tönnies viewed the family as both the origin and essence of Gemeinschaft. Because the family is the most perfect form of Gemeinschaft, to study Gemeinschaft is to study the family. However, though Gemeinschaft was crucial to his argument, Tönnies' analysis of the family left something to be desired.

Gemeinschaft is said to represent a perfect unity of will and it is found, according to Tönnies, in greatest intensity in three types of kin relationship: (1) mother-child; (2) husband-wife ("in its natural or general biological meaning"); and (3) brother-sister. The propelling catalyst toward Gemeinschaft-like qualities varies within each of these three relationships. The intensity of the mother-child relationship is due to instinct and common memories. In contrast, the marital relationship is based on common possession of children and household and the brother-sister relationship is based solely on memories of shared experiences.[7] Though not included within the basic three, Tönnies saw the relationship between father and child as similar to that between brother and sister because the strong instinctive part characteristic of mother and child is missing. However, despite the strength of the imputed instinctive drive in women, men are also seen as finding maximum reward within the family. "The ordinary husband. . . in the long run and for the average of cases. . . feels best and most cheerful if he is surrounded by his family and relatives. He is among his own . . . chez soi" (Tönnies, 1957:43).

The representation of instinctually-based mother-child relations as the ultimate and most intense manifestation of Gemeinschaft sets the pace for Tönnies' later glorification of the non-rational in social relationships. The type of will in operation strongly influences the character of a relationship. For example, the integrity of marriage ties, in Tönnies' argument, is contingent upon the retention of women's traditional status and hence their Gemeinschaft-like nature (and natural will). With female emancipation and Gesellschaft-like independence a marriage,

> . . .degenerate(s) into civil contract. If not concluded for a definite period, such contract may be ended any time by mutual consent, and its monogamic limitations become purely accidental. These are some of the most important trends in a process of rapidly advancing disintegration (Tönnies, 1957:204).

Though Tönnies was equivocal about the emotional rewards of a marriage relationship, he asserted that monogamous marriage can be seen as "a perfect neighborhood - living together, constant physical proximity. Community of daily and nightly abode, of bed and board. . .their spheres of will adjoin but are one, like the communal fields of the villagers" (Tönnies, 1957:193). Though invoking the ties of neighborhood, he did not discuss the possibility of marriages with shared values and "like mind" – qualities which, as will be discussed later, he viewed as important aspects of Gemeinschaft. Consistent with this view, he did not foresee an increased emphasis on or greater expectations of the conjugal unit in modern society.

Tönnies showed keen insight regarding the correlates of emphasis on family life. Although he saw family life as decreasing (Tönnies, 1957:63), this de-emphasis varied between groups. Tönnies' analysis was based upon his distinction between forms of will and the importance of emotionality in relationships. Tönnies noted that there are age, social class and sex differences in the extent to which the family is regarded as important. He observed that commoners, females and children all see family, friends and neighbors as of utmost importance. These same categories of people are also the possessors of "natural will." In contrast, for the educated middle and upper classes, "the family becomes an accidental form for the satisfaction of natural needs, neighborhood and friendship are supplanted by special interest groups and conventional society life" (Tonnies, 1957:168). This was an extremely sensitive observation and one which has not been emphasized by Tönnies' abstractors – a potential contribution of Tönnies' work not capitalized upon by family researchers.

Though recognizing variations in emphasis on the family, Tönnies did not make a specific distinction between the extended family and the family of procreation. Even allowing for possible differences in definition, he still cannot be said to analyze what would be called by observers today the extended family.[8] Although he saw increasing Gesellschaft-like features in a society as detrimental to the "family" he did not distinguish between degrees of familialism.

TÖNNIES' VIEW OF NON-KIN RELATIONSHIPS

Next to kin ties in strength are the Gemeinschafts of physical proximity (neighborhood) and intellectual proximity (friendship). Community, whether of blood, region or values, attracts people to one another and creates mutual understanding.

> Understanding is based upon intimate knowledge of each other . . . and readiness to take part in (ones) joy or sorrow. For that reason, the more the constitution and experience of natural disposition, character, and intellectual attitude are similar or harmonize, the more probable is understanding (Tönnies, 1957:47).

Tönnies characterized Gemeinschaft of place (neighborhood) as the general pattern of living together in the *rural* village. Sacred customs and periodic reunions can maintain these neighborhood ties even when distance separates; however this is basically a "community of physical life" (Tönnies, 1957:42-43). Tönnies emphasized throughout his work that common ownership cements close relationships — he saw the land as "the primoral thing. . .owned by human Gemeinschaft" (Tönnies, 1957:180). The potentialities of Gemeinschaft of place appear to decrease with size, reflecting a negative relationship between population size and Gemeinschaft features. Thus, while both village and town may retain many of the characteristics of the family, the village retains more of these characteristics than the town (Tönnies, 1957:227).

Tönnies saw social relationships with family-like characteristics as Gemeinschaft-like relationships. Such characteristics may be found, for example, within guilds, cults and religious communities (Tönnies, 1957:50). However, he did not specify their specific distinguishing qualities. Family is used as an adjective sufficient unto itself in many parts of Tönnies' writing.

The third (and weakest) form of Gemeinschaft, that of community of mind or friendship, Tönnies saw as independent of neighborhood and kinship. Such bonds develop as a result of similar work conditions or values oriented toward common goals (e.g., religion). Without benefit of blood relationship, Tönnies saw these friendship ties as weakened. Proximity and frequency of contact may make them subject to disputes. "Such purely mental or psychological brotherhoods can stand only to a certain limit the frequency and narrowness of physical proximity of real joint life. They have to find their counterpoise in a high degree of individual freedom" (Tönnies, 1957:44).

In Tönnies' view, extra-kin relations are weak. Neighbor ties have weakened and ties of work, religion (Tönnies, 1957:226) and friendship have eroded. As such ties have become distinguished from the family they have lost their previous strength.

THE IMPACT OF INDUSTRIALIZATION

Industrialization's relationship to the movement from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft is made quite apparent in Tönnies' thesis. The change from the primary society of Gemeinschaft to its polar opposite parallels the movement from agriculture to industry and from a home-based economy to an economy of trade and industry. Tönnies gave an economic interpretation of history. In the Gesellschaft bourgeois society, he agreed with Adam Smith that "everyone is a merchant." As more people within the society learn to be traders, it is less likely that they will be exploited by those already possessing rational will (Tönnies, 1957:80). The self-seeking attitude of those possessed with the rational will of Gesellschaft fits them well for industrialized society where "a sham of politeness" covers the underlying competitiveness. Hence, within this form of society, it is merchants and capitalists who are the "natural rulers." The merchant class develops first along these lines. Other groups will eventually follow until "at least in tendency, the whole people acquire the characteristic of the Gesellschaft" (Tönnies, 1957:225). The introduction of large scale trade into agrarian or small-town scenes sounded the death knell of Gemeinschaft.

THE IMPACT OF URBANIZATION

As noted previously, Tönnies viewed Gemeinschaft of place as characteristic of rural neighborhoods. The possibility of Gemeinschaft in any form appears to decrease in city life (Tönnies, 1957:227). Tönnies has been accused of romanticizing the pre-urban past. In the final edition of his noted book (published some fifty years after the original), he denied this. However, there is clearly an emphasis on the merits of the rural throughout his book. Rural life sustains Gemeinschaft while urban life participates in its destruction.

> . . .all praise of rural life has pointed out that the Gemeinschaft among people is stronger there and more alive; it is the lasting and genuine form of living together. In

> contrast to Gemeinschaft, Gesellschaft is transitory and superficial. Accordingly Gemeinschaft should be regarded as a living organism, Gesellschaft as a mechanical aggregate and artifact (Tönnies, 1957:35)(emphasis supplied).

The city personified Gesellschaft in Tönnies' (1957:227) view and, although he gave passing mention to the cultural advantages of urban life, he did not identify any socio-emotional advantages. "City life and Gesellschaft down the common people to decay and death" (Tönnies, 1957: 30-31). Urban settings are characterized by loss of respect for tradition and decreased family life. In Tönnies' (1957:202) words, the city represents "the victory of egoism, impudence, falsehood and cunning, the ascendancy of greed for money, ambition and lust for pleasure."

With respect to the charge that Tönnies presented a romanticized view of rural life, Nisbet (1967:74) has noted that "a degree of nostalgia is built into the very structure of nineteenth century Sociology." However, even if Tönnies' observations were in keeping with the tenor of his times, his pastoralist approach may still have its carry-over effect on twentieth century views of life in the city.

SUMMARY: TÖNNIES' VIEW OF "TRADITIONAL" AND "MODERN" SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

It should be noted at the outset that Tönnies' dichotomous societal types were the product of nineteenth century European armchair speculation. Although Tönnies was later known for his empirical studies in Germany, his arguments in his first book were supported neither by primary nor secondary data analysis. His observations regarding the characteristics of interpersonal life in pre-modern society can probably, at best, be said to have rested upon his knowledge of European peasantry.

However, one may well question that extent to which his knowledge of this group was sufficient. In addition, while it is true that Tönnies took a historical perspective, this perspective was not buttressed by reliable historical data. The lack of sufficient historical documentation in Tönnies' study indicates the need for prudence in relying upon the validity of its temporal as well as its cultural generalizability.

Table 1 summarises Tonnies' analysis of the major characteristics of social relationships in Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft societies. The relationships in Gemeinschaft society are seen as enduring, collectivity oriented, pervasive, spontaneous and emotional. In contrast, the relationships in Gesellschaft society are short-lived, non-emotionally based, contractual and egoistic. Some observations stand out:

(1) Of those features which Tönnies saw as characteristic of Gesellschaft social life, not one is given positive valence. In contrast, all the traits specified as part of traditional Gemeinschaft social life are evaluated positively. The tenor of Tönnies' writing gives weight to the charge of romanticization of the past.

(2) Although, as previously mentioned, Tönnies allowed for pockets of traditionalism in modern settings, these were seen as carryovers - not as features characteristic of urban industrial life itself. Thus he appeared to assume the eventual "swallowing up" of any remaining Gemeinschaft elements by the irreversible tide of Gesellschaft society unless there were significant changes in the social and political order.

(3) Tönnies did not allow for the possibility of modernized versions of the traditional traits which he evaluated so highly. For example, he viewed Gemeinschaft societies with their lack of emphasis on con-

TABLE 1

TÖNNIES: CHARACTERISTICS OF "TRADITIONAL" AND "MODERN" SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

CHARACTERISTIC	"Traditional" Society (Gemeinschaft)	Evaluation of Contribution	"Modern" Society (Gesellschaft)	Evaluation of Contribution
Blood related	Common	Positive	Uncommon	Negative
Extended duration	Present	Positive	Diminished	Negative
Role pervasive	Present	Positive	Diminished	Negative
Emotional/ non-rational	Present	Positive	Diminished	Negative
Collectivity orientation	Present	Positive	Diminished	Negative

tractual agreements as providing greater freedom and spontaneity. However, urban Gesellschaft settings can be seen as allowing for another form of freedom and spontaneity by virtue of the greater freedom to select the people with whom one would want to associate and by virtue of a wider pool of potential friends from which to choose.

(4) Additionally, Tönnies was fairly consistent in viewing each societal trait in either/or evaluation categories. In so doing, he overlooked the possible advantages of the very features of modern social life which he viewed as disadvantageous. Likewise he did not consider the possibly negative aspects of the traits he ascribed to traditional society. Traits may carry both desirable and undesirable ramifications. For example, within his paradigm the short-lived relationships attributed to Gesellschaft society were evaluated negatively. Tönnies did not consider that intense, short-lived relationships may serve an intense, short-lived purpose and that the availability of such interpersonal encounters may well satisfy people's needs as they perceive them.

Table 2 examines the sources of emotional support which Tönnies saw as available to "traditional" and "modern" peoples. Of the sources of support which Tönnies considered, all were seen as either diminished or absent in Gesellschaft society. Religious, marital, nuclear family, occupational, neighborhood and friendship ties all suffer depletion. Although Tönnies emphasized the importance of family ties, he did not examine what would be accepted as extended kin ties. The vast part of his discussion related to what would be termed in current parlence the nuclear family. Within his discussion, however, there was no indication of special emphasis or forecast of change in modern marital relation-

TABLE 2

TÖNNIES: SOURCES OF EMOTIONAL SUPPORT IN "TRADITIONAL" AND "MODERN" SOCIETIES

Source	"Traditional" Society (Gemeinschaft)	Evaluation of Contribution	"Modern" Society (Gesellschaft)	Evaluation of Contribution
Tribal ties (Pre-lit.family)	Strong	Not Examined	Absent	Not Examined
Conjugal ties	Strong	Positive	Weakened	Negative
Kin ties	Strong	Positive	Weakened	Negative
Neighborhood ties	Strong	Positive	Weakened	Negative
Occupational ties	Strong	Positive	Weakened	Negative
Friendship*	Strong	Positive	Weakened	Negative

*"Gemeinschaft of intellectual proximity."

ships. People in the Gesellschaft society are thus left with few strong supports.

Table 3 summarizes Tönnies' view of the role of the family in Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft societies. It can be seen that Tönnies did not examine the extended family unit. Although at one point he made an amorphous reference to the family as previously a source of status, possible economic support and occasional basis for a common residence, in his discussion of Gemeinschaft society, he did not give weight to this in his discussion and it becomes only an item in passing.

The family is the personification of Gemeinschaft and Gemeinschaft is diminishing, hence we may conclude that the family is diminishing. However, Tönnies did not in any direct way provide in his influential work an analysis of the state of the family, the crucial role components of the family entity, or variations in strength of family extension. "Familiness" was an important attribute in his total argument but Tönnies failed to specify its integral components. His most important, and unfortunately overlooked, contribution to understanding the family probably lies in his analysis of forms of will and the differential attraction to the family on the part of those possessing natural will as opposed to those with rational will. This provides some rather provocative insights, as mentioned earlier. However, although Tönnies praised "familiness" we are given little in the way of guidelines for the examination of kin ties.

Table 4 summarizes the major influences which Tönnies saw as having impact on the nature of interpersonal relationships. From this table emerges a picture of Tönnies' view of the elements which contri-

TABLE 3

TÖNNIES: "TRADITIONAL" AND "MODERN" FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO INTERPERSONAL LIFE

CHARACTERISTICS	"Traditional" Society (Gemeinschaft)	Evaluation of Contribution	"Modern" Society (Gesellschaft)	Evaluation of Contribution
Common property	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined
Common residence	Sometimes	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined
Status conferal	Present	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined
Economic cooperation	Present	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined
Socio-emotional support	Present	Positive	Decreasing	Negative
Strength of conjugal unit	Stable	Neutral to Positive	Weakening	Negative

TABLE 4

TÖNNIES: SUMMARY OF MAJOR INFLUENCES ON INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS AND EVALUATION OF THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUALITY OF A RELATIONSHIP

Positively Evaluated Influences	Neutrally Evaluated Influences	Negatively Evaluated Influences
Emotionalism/spontaneity		Rationality/intellectuality
Extended duration		Individualism/egoism
Blood kin ties		Disregard for tradition
Marital ties		Competition
Collectivity orientation		Capitalism
Propinquity		Urban life
Common possessions		
Common values		
Habit		
Common background		
Common goals		
Common experiences (memories)		
Instinct (maternal)		
Rural life		

bute to a "good" social relationship. These are the variables which, in Tönnies' view, we should examine in evaluating the benefits of inter-personal encounters. According to Tönnies, the relationships which people find most rewarding are non-contractual, based on homogeneity and emotionality, submersion of the individual, shared experiences, shared possessions and kinship ties. The one contractual tie which is evaluated somewhat positively is the marital bond. Tönnies was rather rigidly consistent in viewing the above qualities as making positive contributions to inter-personal relationships. Unfortunately, his value perspective detracts from the larger analysis. It could be argued that each of the positively evaluated traits also carries negative overtones. Likewise similar arguments could be made reversing the benefits of Tönnies' negatively evaluated influences. For example, to illustrate the above criticism, each of Tönnies' positively evaluated qualities will be examined with a view to pointing out what could be regarded by some observers as a negative aspect:

(1) Blood ties which are evaluated positively by Tönnies could be viewed as confining ties which demand allegiance by accident of birth rather than through choice.

(2) Marital ties which Tönnies saw as positive contributions could be viewed as legal bonds which handicap the practical implementation of change in object of affect.

(3) The collectivity orientation which Tönnies saw as a positive contribution could be viewed as a form of conformity which restricts the growth of society and the individual.

(4) Tönnies saw emotionalism as an asset in inter-personal relationships; however, it could be viewed as a hindrance, crippling to one's ability to rationally evaluate interpersonal relationships and to rationally dispose of those which are less rewarding.

(5) Positively evaluated propinquity could be viewed as a claustrophobic handicap limiting people to repeated encounters from which it is difficult to escape.

(6) Shared possessions could be viewed as a disadvantage because this leads to competition or because the material expression of individuality is inhibited.

(7) Shared values could be viewed as a negative contribution to a relationship because this may facilitate intellectual stagnation.

(8) Tönnies saw habit as making a positive contribution to relationships; however, it could be viewed as the indolent acceptance of a relationship in contrast to the regularized reassessment of the "rewardingness" of a relationship.

(9) Common goals were seen as positive contributions. These, like shared possessions, may be seen as provoking competition. One could argue for the advantages of complimentary goals, or of conflicting goals.

(10) Similar backgrounds were seen as making positive contributions to a relationship. As with shared values above, this could be viewed as leading to a stagnant relationship.

(11) Tönnies evaluated shared experiences positively. One could argue that shared experiences deaden a relationship.

(12) Maternal instinct was seen as a positive attribute. Others may argue that this (if it exists) is an accident of birth which inflicts

the child upon the mother and the mother upon the child.

(13) Rural life was seen as a positive contribution. It could be viewed as a numerical restriction on the choice of relationships.

(14) Tönnies viewed enduring relationships positively. These could be viewed as creating boring interpersonal relationships which limit moving on to new encounters and different life stages.

(15) Role pervasive relationships were seen as more rewarding. These could be viewed as lacking the intensity and in-depth, focused, understanding of a role specific relationship.

The above possibly "negative" aspects of relationships, which Tonnies evaluated positively, overlap with each other to some extent but open up alternative ways of viewing these characteristics. The point in this exercise is to illustrate that Table 4 summarizes what Tönnies assumes to be sufficiently established general truths about human behavior. He presumes to know what people find to be the most rewarding elements in an interpersonal relationship. As will be later discussed, some of these untested "social psychological truths" with which Tönnies operated in the nineteenth century may have their twentieth century counterparts.

CONCLUSIONS

Tönnies' Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft concepts have attracted several generations of social observers. Unfortunately some of the more innovative aspects of his typology have not been widely explored. His emphasis on a reversible process of societal change and his differentiation between economic, educational and gender categories regarding attachment to family life were most insightful for his time, but were virtually ignored by scholars who followed.[9] Although Tönnies' work is written from the perspective of a male dominant society and hence a male oriented sociology, and although his work reflects a western European bias, his attempt to explicate the idea of natural will suggests a possibly potent socialization variable. This, if developed, might successfully account for sex, class and educational differences in some forms of behavior. However problematic operationalization of the idea of rational will may be, the idea provides a potential base for intellectual expansion. As will be indicated in the following chapters, some recent criticisms have begun to tentatively explore paths similar to those suggested by Tönnies in the nineteenth century. However, the fact that these have rested for many years in Tönnies' first book is not appreciated. The aspects of his work which attracted other writers were his societal typologies — dichotomous polarities with problems of their own. The extent to which the pastoralist assumptions which accompanied these polarities and the implicit social psychology operating in Tönnies' view of a "good relationship" have carried on as well will be explored in the chapters following.

CHAPTER TWO

FOOTNOTES

1. The criteria for selection consisted of references made by Tönnies in his book and the observations of several other writers concerning possible influences on Tönnies (e.g., Nisbet, 1967; Martindale, 1961; Loomis, 1957; Loomis and McKinney, 1957). Though there is a lack of agreement on specific influences, it is generally agreed that Tönnies was influenced by other writers. Durkheim, in his review of Tönnies' book noted,

> . . .one will find (here) a complete sociology, one will also find a complete philosophy and a complete psychology. Schopenhauer, Karl Marx, Kant, Summer Maine, the evolutionists, in turn, or simultaneously, inspire the author. Such eclectic synthesis naturally makes the reading of the book very laborious, and it is a pity, for one finds interesting ideas there. . . (Durkheim: 1972).

2. Evolutionism was a popular theme in the nineteenth century and Darwin's work did not spring from unfertilized soil. His intellectual debts were many (see Koestler, 1964:130, passim).

3. Comte's right to paternity is not without question. Comte has also been accused of plaigiarizing the most noteworthy part of his work from St. Simon.

4. In 1931 Tönnies wrote a "clarification" of his types (almost fifty years after the original publication). This article appears as Chapter 5 in Loomis'(1957) widely used translation. However, for reasons discussed in the text, the focus of this examination of Tönnies relates to the first major exposition of his position.

5. The analysis of Tönnies' Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft is based on Charles P. Loomis' 1957 translation (Community and Society, Harper Torchbook, Edition, 1957, 1963). All page citations in this chapter refer to this edition unless indicated otherwise.

6. Loomis observes that Tönnies later tried to defend himself against the charge of bias made by his critics. However in Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft his partiality toward the first of the two polar types seems apparent. For example he imputed wisdom to those who were able to see the evils of Gesellschaft. Regarding the possible "resuscitation" of Gemeinschaft, he wrote,

> The moral necessity for such resuscitation has, since this book was written, been recognized more and more by all those who proved themselves capable of judging the tendencies of

modern Gesellschaft clearly and without bias (Tonnies, 1957:196, addition to the 1912 edition).

7. Tönnies did not deal with same-sex siblings and the perhaps differing nature of their relationship in contrast to that of cross-sex siblings.

8. The only item which may be superficially seen as dealing with the extended family is a rather oblique reference to categories within the family: master and mistress (with perhaps additional wives), offspring from that union (with perhaps their married spouses living under one roof) and family servants - who are part of but not as crucial as the other categories to the family (Tönnies, 1957:53).

9. A widely recognized expansion on Tönnies' dichotomy is, of course, Parson's pattern variables. Using the dichotomy as a base, Parsons concluded that it held several distinctions that were independently variable. Hence a structure might display a combination of attributes which exhibit both Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft characteristics (Parsons, 1953; Parsons and Shil, 1954; Parsons and Smelser, 1956).

CHAPTER THREE

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF DURKHEIM AND SIMMEL

The previous chapter discussed Ferdinand Tönnies' influential Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft. Tönnies' typologies were well known at the time Emile Durkheim and Georg Simmel made their contributions to the evolving body of sociological writings dealing with societal complexity and social bonding. Initially Tönnies' Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft did not attract wide attention when first published in 1887. However, Durkheim published a critical review of Tönnies' book in 1889, some four years before his own work, The Division of Labor was first published. Durkheim thus had the opportunity to contrast the evolving argument in his first major work (some six years in the writing) against Tönnies' already published volume. An examination of Durkheim's (1972) review suggests that he was, as would be expected, comparing Tönnies' position with his own societal dichotomy. Simmel, as a compatriot of Tönnies (both were teaching in German universities) would assuredly have been familiar with Tönnies' work. Any attempt to establish links between the two would only be speculative however. Whether Tönnies' early work influenced Simmel's work is not the essential concern. The primary concern is the degree to which all three of these "founding fathers" may have shared common assumptions and thus potentially could have served as a collective influence on researchers who followed.

EMILE DURKHEIM: INTRODUCTION

The sociological contributions and influence of the French sociologist Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) have been major. Durkheim enjoyed early and widespread recognition in his native France and became its first academic sociologist. He had a wide following and played an influential role both in academia and in the broader French intellectual setting (Coser, 1971:148). Durkheim's respectability came slowly to the United States however. Hinkle's (1960) examination of all published references to Durkheim by American sociologists between 1870 and 1939 indicates that up until the late 1920's Durkheim's work was generally disregarded. Starting in 1931 with his appointment at the University of Chicago, the anthropologist A.R. Radcliffe-Brown played an important role in introducing Durkheim in North America (Nisbet, 1965:3-6). The writings of Talcott Parsons (e.g., 1937) and Robert Merton (e.g., 1938) and the increasing popularity and ultimate near-dominance of the functionalist approach in American sociology eventually assured Durkheim a major role in the history of North American sociology.[1]

Two of Durkheim's works stand out as having had particular relevance to the research dealing with social bonds in modern societies. These are Durkheim's doctoral dissertation, The Division of Labor in Society, first published in 1893 (the first English translation of which appeared in 1933) and Suicide, first published in 1897 (first translated into English in 1951). The contents of these two books will be examined - focusing particularly on those sections in which Durkheim deals with the supportive social ties of modern society and presents his suggestions for remedying its apparent ills.

PRE-MODERN AND MODERN SOCIETY

Durkheim, like Tönnies and many other nineteenth century writers, examined societal development in terms of polar dichotoma. The terms used by Durkheim stand almost in opposition to Tönnies' familiar concepts (Sorokin, 1928:491; Aldous, 1972:1191-1192). Modern society is characterized by organic solidarity (which serves to emphasize Durkheim's view of the "naturalness" of this type of society) and traditional societies are characterized by mechanical solidarity.

Modern societies differ from traditional societies in that the ties of family, religion and polity are diminished. However, the fact of the division of labor acts to create a form of solidarity different from that of pre-modern societies. This Durkheim refers to as organic solidarity. In such societies there is gradual replacement of repressive laws with restitutive. Contractual law follows as an expression of organic solidarity.

Simple societies with minimal division of labor are, in Durkheim's view, characterized by mechanical solidarity which is rooted in the similarity of group members and common practices and beliefs. Such societies are characterized by segmental structure of family or clan units. Social control is punitative and based on repressive techniques. The collective conscience almost completely submerges the individual.

It is interesting that in his later writing Durkheim never again made reference to the mechanical-organic solidarity distinction. In fact, Durkheim seemed in his later writing to reject the sufficiency of organic solidarity. Both Nisbet (1966) and Coser (1971) agree in feeling that Durkheim made a major shift in his initial position about midway in his discussion in The Division of Labor. Moving from the position that the interdependence of societal parts contributes sufficiently to solidarity in modern society and the constraining social ties of traditional society are now irrelevant, he began in the second half of the book to note the benefits of group supports. The insufficiency of modern social ties and the negative impact of this condition is clearly presented in Suicide (published four years after The Division of Labor) and this position is reiterated and expanded upon in his famous preface to the second edition of The Division of Labor, "Some Notes on Occupational Groups" which is now regarded as a classic (Simpson, 1964:vii).

In Suicide, Durkheim stated that the adverse effects of modern social life contribute to increasing the number of voluntary deaths. This he saw not as an indicator of advanced civilization but as a crisis condition. Both egoistic and anomic suicide rates are influenced by the breakdown in group solidarity. Durkheim wrote on egoistic suicide:

> Egoistic suicide results from the fact that society is not sufficiently integrated at all points to keep its members under its control. . . thus the only remedy. . . is to restore enough consistency to social groups for them to obtain a firmer grip on the individual, and for him to feel bound to them (Durkheim, 1951:375).

Likewise anomic suicide is influenced by weakened social supports:

> Anomy. . . springs from the lack of collective forces at certain points in society; that is, of groups established for the regulation of social life (Durkheim, 1951:382).

Durkheim did not call for a resurgence of previous group supports of kin, religion, or territory. He instead was looking for a "new" form of support. In essence, he appeared to be trying to provide a revised type of mechanical solidarity to provide a modernized collective conscience. His proposed solution lay in the formation of small occupational associations which would provide individuals with care, support and social control. Without these supports, without some close-knit society in miniature, without the embrace of a collective conscience, modern man would be lost. Durkheim saw regulation on the social life of man as necessary for his comfort and security. The individual needs to submit himself to the larger will. Common interests reflect this need. Like attracts like not just to reinforce but "to associate, that is, not to feel lost among adversaries, to have the pleasure of community, to make one out of many, which is to say, finally, to lead the same moral life together" (Durkheim, 1933:15). Both kin and non-kin "morality" are so formed.

Durkheim has been referred to by Coser (1971) as an optimist in contrast to the Germanic pessimism of Tönnies. However, a careful reading of Division of Labor and Suicide does not indicate a positive analysis of the present (quite the contrary). The present is, in fact, a stage of none too pleasant transition. In the final analysis, Durkheim was very similar to Comte in seeing the destruction of traditional groups as detrimental to man. Their solutions differ of course. For Comte it was Positivism. For Durkheim humankind's only salvation lies in the formation of all-encompassing guild-like occupational groupings.

DURKHEIM ON THE FAMILY

The modern family differs from its traditional counterpart. Previously the family was much more than a unit of affect. Family, according to Durkeim, meant tradition, reputation, ancestral home and property. This is disappearing. "If men. . . do not replace this age-old objective of their activity, as it little by little disappears from among them, a great void must inevitably appear in existence" (Durkheim, 1951:377). The opportunities and ambitions of modern life are pulling people away from the family orbit. "No scheme can. . . restore the indivisibility which was the family's strength" (Durkheim, 1951:378).

In contrast to Tönnies, Durkheim did not view consanguinity as possessing an irresistable lure. It facilitates but does not necessitate interpersonal closeness. The stronger influences (which are often associated with the impact of consanguinity) are community of ideas and interest, common neighborhood and common danger (Durkheim, 1933:123).

Durkheim saw the corporation replacing the family as it was previously known. In pre-modern society agricultural and economic interests were encompassed within the family unit. Now ". . .the corporation has been, in a sense, the heir of the family. As long as industry is exclusively agricultural, it has, in the family and in the village, which is itself only a sort of great family, its immediate organ, and it needs no other" (Durkheim, 1933:17).

The modern family has lost its previous unity and thus, in large measure, its efficacy is also gone. The family unit is now short-lived for children leave home at an early age. "For most of the time, at present, the family may be said to be reduced to the married couple alone, consequently, since it plays a smaller role in life, it no longer suffices as an object of life" (Durkheim, 1951:377). Durkheim saw the history of the family as a progressive differentiation in the form of division of tasks according to age, sex and social position (1933:123). Pre-modern marriages were less sharply differentiated and hence less stable. In contrast to this, modern marriage makes distinctions between the sexes along affective and intellectual lines (1933:60).[2] The clear division of labor in modern marriages adds to conjugal solidarity (1933:56). Thus, although the wider meaning of family has changed, and it is no longer an effective unit of control and support, the nuclear unit has, in fact, strengthened. One can readily see in Durkheim's discussion the stage being set for Parsons' isolated nuclear family hypothesis.[3]

EXTRA-KIN RELATIONS

In Durkheim's view, the previous strengths of religion (Durkheim, 1933:169), family, and territory (1933:187) have eroded. Modern man is faced with this fact. Ties of material neighborhood may exist in an attenuated form because they still answer some needs, but they will lose their force (1933:28-29n). Family forms in the nuclear sense exist but without the overwhelming strength of the larger family unit of a previous era. All of these groups are now inadequate (Durkheim, 1955:379) and cannot meet the support needs of man.

Durkheim saw the need to replace these old ties. The suggested replacements were occupational groups or corporations. These guild-like groups would provide control, rules, social service and warmth to men (1933:26). Durkheim emphasized the major import of the occupational role in modern society. To him it could be a unifying element.

> Since it consists of individuals devoted to the same tasks with solitary or even combined interests, no soil is better calculated to bear social ideas and sentiments. Identity of origin, culture and occupation makes occupational activity the richest sort of material for common life (1955:378).

Occupational groups have an advantage over the modern family because of what Durkheim saw as their perpetuity and their important connection with economic life (with which the family was once, but is no longer, involved, 1933:31). Durkheim did not suggest that occupational groups currently meet this need (hence man is now rather adrift). What he suggested was that occupational groups can (and should) become the major support mechanisms of modern man. He saw the need for these groups to enjoy public recognition of their role and to have clearly specified functions, e.g., ". . .presiding over companies of insurance, benevolent aid and pensions, . . .over the disputes constantly arising between the branches of the same occupation, to fix conditions, . . with which contracts must agree in order to be valid. . . to prevent the strong from exploiting the weak, etc." (Durkheim, 1951:380). Each occupation should have such an organization and then, ". . . the social fabric, the meshes of which are so dangerously relaxed, would tighten and be strengthened throughout its entire extent" (Durkheim, 1951:381).

In Durkheim's view, people are attracted both to those with similar interests (Durkheim, 1933:14) and to those with complimentary differences (1933:54-55). The occupational corporation is attractive on both counts. Society needs cohesion and regularity (1933:5), it is now passing through a crisis (1933:29), it is the corporation which ". . . has everything needed to give the individual a setting to draw him out of his state of moral isolation; and faced by the actual inadequacy of the other groups, it alone can fulfill this indispensable office" (Durkheim, 1955:379).

DURKHEIM ON THE DIVISION OF LABOR

Durkheim's position in The Division of Labor was that this phenomenon was crucial for understanding the nature of modern society. Traditional societies were unified by mechanical solidarity based on their similarities, while modern society with division of labor had a different form of solidarity based on differentiated tasks and the resulting interdependence of societal parts. This he termed organic solidarity. As discussed earlier, Durkheim's position regarding the sufficiency of the division of labor changed to the point where he regarded it as essential that there be some form of group support to supplant those ties which were lost as society developed.

Population increase was seen as facilitating the division of labor and the decline of mechanical solidarity. With population increase "moral density" (or social interaction) is usually increased. This results in increased competitiveness which is a threat to societal cohesion. The division of labor serves to decrease competition by increasing interdependence.

Though generally Durkheim saw the division of labor as proceeding in situations where there was increased population volume, and thus increased permeability across population sub-groups, he observed that there are differences between societies regarding the necessary concomittants of the division of labor. It is possible for cellular units to remain relatively intact alongside the division of labor. The division of labor is generally responsive to internal changes, but because it is a "derived and secondary phenomenon" it may respond to external factors.

> It is sufficient, then, that some sort of circumstances excite an urgent need of material well-being with a people for the division of economic labor to be developed without the social structure sensibly changing. The spirit of imitation, the contact of a more refined civilization can produce this result (Durkheim, 1933:282n).

Durkheim thus allowed for cultural variability in response to the division of labor. Unfortunately, he did not expand upon this observation made only in footnote form.

Durkheim denied that the division of labor dehumanizes man. It is not a necessary concomittant of the division of labor that man be turned into a machine (Durkheim, 1933:371, 72, 73). This may happen but if so, general aesthetic education for workers is not the solution (this would only make them incapable of functioning on their specialized jobs). Instead, according to Durkheim, what is needed is for the worker to see his specific task as part of the larger whole so that he realizes that he is making a contribution.

> The division of labor presumes that the worker, far from being hemmed in by his task, does not lose sight of his collaborators, that he acts upon them, and reacts to them. He is, then, not a machine who repeats his movements without knowing their meaning, but he knows that they tend, in some way, towards an end that he conceives more or less distinctly. He feels that he is serving something. For that he need not embrace vast portions of the social horizon; it is sufficient that he perceive enough of it to understand that his actions have an aim beyond themselves (Durkheim, 1933:372-373).

Apparently lumping together all forms of work specialization from science to assembly line, Durkheim argued that there is no inherent superiority in generalized work activity as opposed to specific, intense activity. "Why would there be more dignity in being complete and mediocre, rather than in living a more specialized, but more intense life. . ." (Durkheim, 1933:403).

DURKHEIM ON URBANIZATION

Although there are some strong similarities between Durkheim and Tönnies in their view of the city, Durkheim's analysis differed both in terms of the implications drawn, and the generally greater sophistication of his examination. Durkheim viewed the process of urbanization relatively calmly and foresaw an increasing erosion of rural life. He observed:

> . . .(Urbanization) far from constituting a sort of pathological phenomenon. . . comes from the very nature of higher social species. The supposition that this movement has attained alarming proportions in our societies today, which perhaps no longer have sufficient suppleness to adapt themselves, will not prevent this movement from continuing either within our societies or after them (Durkheim, 1933:259).

Durkheim argued that the population of large cities is heavily composed of young migrants who, in moving away from the family, have freed themselves from ties with older relatives. Hence there is less respect for age and tradition in urban areas. The individual is freer from the bonds of groups, there is less social control and a sense of mutual indifference prevails. Intelligence is keener in urban areas but consequently mental disorders are more common (1933:273). With the weakening of traditional groups, the rate or frequency of interaction increases and "personal bonds are rare and weak" (1933:299).

Up to this point, the assumptions which Durkheim made about the city are fairly similar to those of Tönnies. Durkheim's city dwellers have weakened family ties, greater intellect with negative side-effects, less respect for tradition, less social control, mutual indifference and generally weak interpersonal bonds. He observed that though there are these changes in traditional bases of support and cohesion, the city is innovative, future-oriented and the home of progress (1933:296). Durkheim, as did Tönnies, acknowledged that civilization itself is a consequence of such urbanization. Science, art, economic activity and cultural life develop in the city (1933:336-337).

The unique observation which Durkheim made – one which has not been sufficiently expanded upon by later writers – is that population increase per se need not result in the urban characteristics described above. This is based upon his conception of cellular units within the larger mass of the city – units which may insulate the individual. "The greater the development of the cellular system, the more are our relations enclosed within the limits of the cell to which we belong. . . . Social life (is) concentrated in a multitude of little centres, distinctive and alike. . ."(Durkheim, 1933:257). As these social segments become permeable, the division of labor is brought about. Durkheim distinguished between physical density and moral(or dynamic) density. By the term moral density, he meant the amount or rate of interpersonal interaction. Advances in communication and transportation act to increase the moral density of an area. However, Durkheim suggested that there may well be areas where physical density is high while moral density is limited. Although moral density cannot grow without growth of material density (volume of population), it is possible for areas with large population numbers to exist without a large number of permeable cells (i.e., people interacting). Durkheim presented this as a hypothesis noting, "This is a question to be studied. We believe we have noticed that in populous cities which are not dense, collective opinion keeps its strength" (1933: 299n). In such cases, one may say that the large city is composed of a number of little cities,(1933:299) homogeneous units united by a collective conscience. This distinction between sheer numbers and breadth of interaction in the city was a provocative one which has received little note.

Though Durkheim referred to moral density as amount of interpersonal interaction - this in fact needs to be clarified. One may well predict that the amount of interaction may be greater in tight cellular units. However it is the amount of inter-cellular interaction which would promote cell permeability. Durkheim did not make this distinction and also did not provide guidelines for measuring moral density. Obviously this poses a knotty measurement problem. However, the penetrating observation that there may be urban areas composed of cities within a city is one which would have benefited many of the early urban research investigations as we shall detail later.

SUMMARY: DURKHEIM'S VIEW OF PRE-MODERN AND MODERN SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

In summarizing Durkheim's view of pre-modern and modern social ties it is essential to again mention the shift which he made mid-way in his arguments in The Division of Labor. It will be recalled that initially his position was that the interdependence of societal parts in modern society was sufficient to provide organic solidarity - a unity based on interdependent diversity. Hence the previous interdependence of pre-modern peoples which resulted from their similarities and traditional ties such as religion, family and territory is irrelevant to modern society.

It would be interesting to know what changes, if any, were introduced into the evolving argument when Durkheim read Tönnies' Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft. Durkheim's review of Tönnies' book was published four years before the publication of The Division of Labor. Durkheim characterized Tönnies' work as difficult to read, but provocative. Tönnies' work was distinguished by his rather blight-ridden picture of the social ties of modern man. Certainly in Durkheim's work there was almost an about-face taken in the second half of his book. At this point he began to treat the solidarity purportedly provided by the division of labor as insufficient for the support and control needs of modern society. Durkheim differed from Tönnies in that he did not see the feasibility of resurrecting old support ties. However, without Tönnies' impassioned rhetoric, Durkheim too saw a socio-emotional void in modern life. His view regarding the current inadequacy of support ties was repeated in his following work, Suicide, and elaborated still further in the preface to the second edition of The Division of Labor. In the process of moving on from his first work, Durkheim rather quietly abandoned his earlier mechanical-organic solidarity distinction. Even though Durkheim ignored this dichotomy in his later work, it is interesting, and perhaps suggestive again of the lure of such polarities, that his admirers continue to place the dichotomy among Durkheim's most unique and important contributions.

Durkheim's methodology in The Division of Labor and Suicide stands in sharp contrast to Tönnies'. Durkheim made a more careful effort to document his assertions. He made broader use of cross-cultural materials from anthropological research. He used government statistics. He made greater use of historical materials. All in all, although his data, like Tönnies', was heavily drawn from documentary materials, Durkheim's work encompassed a much broader perspective than that of Tönnies. Additionally, he attempted to make his analysis more dispassionate than had Tönnies. This is particularly evident, for example, in his discussion of urbanization and the resulting changes in interpersonal relations. He suggested interesting hypotheses regarding cultural differences in urbanization and, through his concepts of moral density and cell permeability, provided a far more sophisticated analysis than Tönnies' rather blanket characterization of urban ills.

Durkheim (probably more than Tönnies, who attempted to analyse "female like" natural will) rather successfully overlooked women in his generalizations about humankind. (Where, for example, will dependent wives, daughters and mothers find supportive ties in a society whose cohesiveness is based on guild-like structures?) Barclay Johnson has well summarized the degree of Durkheim's explanatory success regarding the female portion of humankind:

> If one pieces together Durkheim's widely scattered remarks on the subject of various female suicide rates, the following inconsistent (and rather curious) doctrines of womanhood are to be found: (1) Women participate in social life, but find it a hardship and need liberty. (The case of childless married women.) (2) Women participate in social life, but in a different way from men. (Ibid., p. 431) (3) Women have weak moral and intellectual needs, are unaffected by society, and in fact do not participate in society (Ibid., pp. 166, 272, 299, 385) So muddled and fluctuating a doctrine must have been made up as circumstances required, quite after the fact (Johnson, 1965:881n).

Durkheim's dual premise that society needs to control the individual and that the individual benefits from societal control accompanied his argument for substitute support ties in modern life. Table 5 contrasts the characteristics of traditional and modern social relationships as discussed by Durkheim. Traditional society is seen as providing fewer total contacts, less permeability of the group, respect for age and tradition and less intellectual orientation. These conditions Durkheim evaluated neutrally. It is in the area of social control that his value concerns become apparent. The mutual indifference and lessened social control of modern society which Durkheim saw are a cause for negative evaluation and some alarm. Although Durkheim did not emphasize emotionalism (as did Tönnies in his glorification of the non-intellectual), he characterized urban relationships as more intellectual and "consequently" urban areas have more mental disorders. Nevertheless, nothing like the strident pastoralism of Tönnies is found in Durkheim's work. As mentioned previously, Durkheim's distinction between types of cities and the possibility of large numbers of people living in insulated, non-permeable, cellular units was a keen observation. Durkheim, far more than Tönnies, allowed for cross-cultural variability in his characterization of urban life.

Table 6 summarizes Durkheim's view of the sources of social support available in the pre-modern and modern societies. The ties of kin, religion, neighborhood, occupation, geography and polity are seen as weak in modern society. Only the conjugal unit has strengthened due to specialization and the division of labor within the marital unit. With this in mind, and given his concern for supportive social control

TABLE 5

DURKHEIM: CHARACTERISTICS OF TRADITIONAL AND MODERN SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

CHARACTERISTIC	Traditional Society	Evaluation of Contribution	Modern Society	Evaluation of Contribution
Extended duration	Common	Positive	Diminished	Negative
Quantity of contacts	Less	Neutral	More	Neutral
Permeability	Absent	Neutral	Present	Neutral
Indifference	Absent	Positive	Present	Negative
Social control	Strong	Positive	Weakened	Negative
Intellectual/ rational	Less	Neutral	Stronger	Semi-negative
Respect for age and tradition	Strong	Neutral	Weakened	Neutral

TABLE 6

DURKHEIM: SOURCES OF EMOTIONAL SUPPORT IN TRADITIONAL AND MODERN SOCIETIES

Support Source	Traditional Society	Evaluation of Contribution	Modern Society	Evaluation of Contribution
Tribal ties (Pre-lit.family)	Strong	Neutral	Absent	Neutral
Conjugal ties	Unstable	Neutral	Strengthened	Neutral
Kin ties	Strong	Neutral	Weakened	Neutral
Religious ties	Strong	Neutral	Weakened	Neutral
Neighborhood ties	Strong	Neutral	Weakened	Neutral
Occupational ties	Strong	Positive	Weakened	Negative
Friendship	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined
Geographical ties	Strong	Neutral	Weakened	Neutral
Political ties	Strong	Neutral	Weakened	Neutral

mechanisms, Durkheim urged a revitalization of one of the previous sources of socio-emotional support in traditional society. His focus on the resurgence of guild-like occupational groups reflected his view that shared involvement in the economic sphere together with the endurance of such organizations over time qualified these structures to successfully substitute for the many support ties found in pre-modern society. It is apparent from this table that Durkheim took a less value-laden stand regarding the demise of the previous sources of support in traditional society (in sharp contrast to Tönnies), however his evaluative efforts were directed toward the belief that occupational ties must be revitalized.

Table 7 summarizes Durkheim's view of the characteristics of traditional and modern families. The family unit of an earlier era was strong. It shared property, economic concerns and provided status. Importantly, in Durkheim's view, the family stood indivisible and was an effective agent of social control. This has changed. The family unit is now basically limited to the conjugal unit. Durkheim did not recognize nor attempt to explain variations in attitudes toward the family in modern society (as did Tönnies). However, Durkheim's emphasis on the decreasing role of the larger family unit and the increasing role of the conjugal unit (which Tönnies did not foresee) are now familiar themes in more recent writings on the sociology of the family.

Table 8 summarizes the major factors which Durkheim saw as having impact on the nature of interpersonal relationships. The table illustrates Durkheim's emphasis on the importance of the group. Group control and restraint are positive influences. Group indivisability is a

TABLE 7

DURKHEIM: TRADITIONAL AND MODERN FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO INTER-PERSONAL LIFE

CHARACTERISTICS	Traditional Society	Evaluation of Contribution	Modern Society	Evaluation of Contribution
Common property	Present	Neutral	Not Examined	Not Examined
Common residence	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined
Reciprocal help	Present	Positive	Weakened	Negative
Status conferal	Present	Neutral	Not Examined	Not Examined
Inculcation of tradition	Strong	Neutral	Weakened	Neutral
Economic cooperation	Present	Positive	Absent	Negative
Conjugal solidarity	Weak	Neutral	Strong	Neutral
Conjugal division of labor	Weak	Positive	Strong	Positive
Effective social control	Yes	Positive	No	Negative
Indivisability	Strong	Positive	Weak	Negative

TABLE 8

DURKHEIM: SUMMARY OF MAJOR INFLUENCES ON INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS AND EVALUATION OF THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE QUALITY OF A RELATIONSHIP

Positively Evaluated Influences	Neutrally Evaluated Influences	Negatively Evaluated Influences
Extended duration	Urban life	Competition
Similar interests	Blood kin ties	Lack of task differentiation
Complimentary differences	Marital ties	Mutual indifference
Group control and restraint		
Common danger		
Common neighborhood		
Common economic involvement		
Division of labor resulting in interdependence		
Group indivisability		

positive influence. His concern, in contrast to Tönnies, was less with the plight of modern man than with the plight of the modern society which cannot properly control the individual. In contrast to Tönnies who emphasized the benefits of homogeneity (expressed in shared experiences, possessions, values, background, goals and blood ties), Durkheim stressed controlled differences. Similar interests and complimentary differences were seen as positive contributions to a relationship. Relationships in which there is a clear-cut division of labor are beneficial since he assumed that interdependence accompanies division of labor. The Consensus universalis which Comte had sought seems achievable in Durkheim through the almost total immersion of the individual in the group.[4] This is reflected in another way in Durkheim's call, not for the resurgence of groups which existed previously and might conflict with one another, but for the resurgence of one group, the occupational.

GEORG SIMMEL: INTRODUCTION

Georg Simmel (1858-1918) is regarded in North America as one of the founding fathers of modern sociology. Simmel was born in Berlin, the son of a businessman who died when Simmel was still a child. A wealthy family friend was appointed as Simmel's guardian and it was an inheritance from this man which enabled Simmel to be independently wealthy and support his scholarly interests despite an academic career marked by controversy and disappointment.[5]

Simmel was an extremely popular lecturer with a lively delivery and facility with words which attracted students and non-university admirers. Within the university, however, his "style" of lecturing, which was also reflected in his writings, attracted critics. That Simmel is readable few would question, however the lack of scientific rigor in his work has continued to provoke criticisms (Coser, 1965:37-39; Sorokin, 1928).[6]

Simmel wrote widely and published major works not only in sociology (for which he is best known in North America) but in general philosophy, philosophy of history, ethics, philosophy of art, philosophy of contemporary civilization and metaphysics. In fact, he is probably more commonly identified in Germany as a philosopher than a sociologist (Etzkorn, 1968:7).

Between 1893 and 1910 several of Simmel's writings (most of which were translated by Albion Small) appeared in American periodicals - particularly in the American Journal of Sociology. Additionally, Simmel served as one of ten "advising editors" for the Journal during its formative period.

At the turn of the century, American sociology was attempting to define itself and was still under the strong influence of European theoretical and philosophical literature. Many of the early American sociologists studied for a period in Europe and Germany was an intellectual Mecca for young scholars abroad. This was a period when the highly educated in North America were not commonly limited to fluency in but one language. Hence, the slow paced appearance of translated works by men such as Durkheim or Simmel does not necessarily mirror the extent of their intellectual impact.[7]

Simmel's work is of particular relevance to our interest in urban industrial social bonds because of his impact on the Chicago school of urban research. Coser (1965:24) notes that Simmel's work was of major influence on the fathers of American urban sociology.

> . . . the delineation of urban personalities and of the peculiar life-styles of urban man which are to be found in the works of Robert Park or Louis Wirth can, in large measure, be traced to Simmel, especially to his essay on 'The Metropolis and Mental Life.' Simmel's peculiar intimacy with the problems of social distance enabled him to capture key characteristics of the life-styles of metropolitan man that were directly echoed in the work of the urban sociologists of the Chicago school.

The classic Introduction to the Science of Sociology, published by Robert E. Park and Ernest Burgess in 1921, contained several excerpts from Simmel's work. Park and Burgess' text, which is far removed from the often simplistic coverage of many of today's introductory sociology texts, was used by both undergraduate and graduate students. Interestingly, to a generation of graduate students both at Chicago and elsewhere, this text was known as the "green Bible" and considered an essential aid in studying for graduate examinations. In their book, Park and Burgess referred to Simmel more frequently than to any other author (Wolff, 1950:xlv). They specifically praised Simmel's work by saying that "Simmel has made the one outstanding contribution to a sociology or perhaps better, a social philosophy of the city in his paper, "The Great City and Cultural Life" (Park and Burgess, 1921:331).

Simmel was a prodigious writer. Rosenthal and Lberlaunder (1945) list 252 works by Simmel alone. Wolff (1950) adds more than 25 additional references to the Rosenthal and Lberlaunder compilation. Though prolific, Simmel did not develop an integrated theoretical system. Much of his work consists of separate essays meant to represent what he termed forms of social interaction. The materials used in this analysis are drawn from primary sources available in English translation.[8]

Simmel rejected both the organicist approach and the influential idealist ideographic approach to studying social life. The legitimate subject for sociology is not an encyclopedic examination of everything human, nor is it found in historicism. For Simmel it is the forms of interaction which constitute the essence of society. Hence the legitimate role for sociology is the study of the patterns of interaction which occur across aims or purposes. In other words, it is the means that are studied — the end, the specific subject matter or "content" is not for the sociologist to catalogue though he may use it as an example (as Simmel did so well).[9] Conflict and competition, the division of labor and other "forms" may occur in religious organizations, families, business organizations, the military and so on. To focus on any of the latter is to focus on content when the sociological rewards are to be found in studying form. Simmel has been referred to as the founder of the "formal school" (Spykman, 1928), however this designation has been disputed and the formal approach severely criticized (e.g., Sorokin, 1928).

In defense of Simmel's use of the "form" and "content" concepts, Coser (1965:8) writes:

> In formal analysis, certain features of concrete phenomena, which are not readily observable unless a perspective is applied to them, are extracted from reality. Once this has been successfully accomplished, it becomes possible to compare phenomena which may be radically different in concrete content yet essentially similar in structural arrangement. . .(Simmel) was not asserting that forms have a separate and distinct

existence, but that they inhere in content and can have no separate reality.

For Simmel a multiplicity of forms exist and they are never "pure." A dialectical approach is found throughout his work. There is never "pure" conflict nor "pure" consensus. There is never "pure" individuality. Societal forms may allow expression of individuality but may also inhibit it. Thus he stressed a dialectical tension between individual and society.

PRE-MODERN AND MODERN SOCIETY

Simmel differs from Durkheim and Tönnies in that he did not apply distinct terms to pre-modern and modern societies. However, his interpretation of social change in modern society appears as a familiar amalgamation of the writings of the period. One can readily find similarities to Marx, Durkheim and Tönnies and others. As with Tönnies and Durkheim, Simmel was interested in issues of social solidarity, the movement from homogeneity to heterogeneity and the division of labor. Simmel saw the eighteenth century as having severed the "historical roots in the state and in religion, morals and economics, while the nineteenth century brought increasing specialization." The proliferation of group memberships is an indicator of modernity. In pre-modern societies men were involved in social circles which occupied their whole personality, i.e., kin, guild, and village. The group claimed the total individual but at the same time it also provided solidarity.

In contrast to this, Simmel saw modern society as having many well-defined social circles, none of which involves the total self.

Family is separate from religion and occupation, religion is differentiated from kin and neighborhood. Personality is segmented. The individual has freedom from domination and a sense of uniqueness and individualism, but he must rely upon himself and he is denied the social support of a close-knit group. The individual faces moments of isolation yet there are many different types of interest groups with which he may align himself.

As society develops, individuals move farther outside the original family affiliation. There is a general movement away from groups whose cohesion rests on geographical and physiological (blood) similarities toward groups based on specific interests. Simmel used trade unions as an example. With modernity, their associational base has moved from primarily neighborhood to basically occupational similarity. In this case the sphere of freedom has been broadened because affiliation is by choice.

According to Simmel, in the medieval period the people were part of the group rather than treated as individuals. In such group associations people were supposedly equals and there was little division of labor. Simmel described it as akin to a system of concentric circles in which individuals were part of groups which were part of larger groups (e.g., a member of a city which is part of a league of cities or a convent member part of a large group of convents). People do not contribute to the larger group as individuals but only as smaller group members. Hence the unique characteristics of the individual are not salient. These concentric circles represent a transition from the previous complete absorption (in the clan or family) to a nominal form of membership in a larger group which then changed to the modern form of multi-group membership which stresses individuality. This adds to individuality because the multi-group memberships of any one individual are rarely duplicated. Hence Simmel described the modern individual as "standing at the (usually unique) intersection of (his personal) social circles."

SIMMEL ON THE FAMILY

Simmel saw "permanent associations" such as the family, guilds and classes, as less important for study than types of social interactions. Such "official formations," as Simmel termed them, may be of scholarly interest but there are more important priorities. Many interactions which at first glance might appear to be of lesser importance have the advantage of "filling in the space between those, so to speak, official formations," and thus "bring really into existence the society that we know" (Heberle, 1965:252, emphasis added).

Because of Simmel's interest in these interactions, the portions of his work which focused on the family are limited in number, fragmentary, and often presented to illustrate some broader point of concern rather than to examine family life per se. What follows then is an attempt to present a composite picture of Simmel's view of the modern family.

Similar to other writers, Simmel saw the original group affiliation as within the family. However, as society develops its individuals move outside this affiliation. There is a general movement away from groups whose cohesiveness rests on geographic and physiological (blood) similarities toward groups based on specific interests.

Within the modern family various factors which would provide solidarity for any group and which previously provided for the specific solidarity of the traditional family have now eroded. In earlier times the common territory of the ancestral home acted to unite the family (Spykman, 1928:152); now the family is diffused and hence weakened. Permanence of locality, one contributor to group solidarity, is gone. Other elements which previously united have also changed. "Of all the elements that formerly contributed to the persistence of the family, such as occupation, religion, tradition, etc., only the physiological factors remain" (Spykman, 1928:166). By the term physiological factor, Simmel meant the gradual replacement of the group which is characteristic of generational change in the family. The gradual replacement of members contributes to group stability, whether the group in question be the family, the Catholic clergy or a bureaucracy.

Simmel (1950:114) suggested that the extended patriarchal family (which he saw no longer existing) operates within a specific numerical range of members. It can carry out its traditional functions only within a range of from twenty to thirty members. The extended patriarchal family is characterized by intimacy, solidarity to the pater familias, responsiveness to the needs of the collective and the male head. The upper functional size limit of the family group is determined by the needs for dependence and control, while the lower functional limit is determined by the minimum number of members required to provide offence, defense, meet supportive needs and allow collective religiousity. Simmel's suggestion that there is a numerical range within which the traditional extended family can operate reflects his interest in the effects of numbers on interaction. It is an interesting suggestion which can give rise to further speculation on the topic. However; it is an example of one of several interesting hypotheses which Simmel developed and then presented as assertions without any empirical support.

The nature of modern social involvements has changed. However, Simmel saw people needing to in some way reveal their "deeper selves." In modern society there is a tendency to fulfil this need through the marital relationship. Modern marriage, according to Simmel, now carries greater expectations, not only social and economic, but also erotic, in order to meet needs for love, intimacy and reciprocal self-revelation. Although Simmel attached positive valence to such self-exposure, his warning that many people may reveal "too much," as it were, and use up their supply of interesting revelations suggests the possible strain of one dyadic relationship having to carry the responsibility for such major needs. Given Simmel's concern with what Nisbet (1966) has referred to as the "molecular community" it is surprising that Simmel did not give much consideration to the socio-emotional rewards of family life (past or present) other than in his examination of the marital dyad. He did not consider the relationships of parent-child, parent-adult child or siblings, much less a larger totality of familiness.

EXTRA-KIN RELATIONSHIPS

With the changes in the nature of association in modern society two principle kinds of relationship may be based upon the total person - the marital relationship and friendship. What friendship may lack in intensity, it may make up for in evenness and stability. Modern friendship is differentiated and becomes specialized. There may be friendships based on common religion, on common experience, on shared intellectuality or other commonalities. Only separate, distinct aspects of the modern individual are open to each specific friend. Simmel, rather cryptically observed, "modern man possibly has too much to hide to sustain a friendship in the ancient sense" (Simmel, 1960:326). Simmel was interested in the degree of openness in various relationships, the amount of reciprocal revelation. An interesting observation made by Simmel (1950:326) was that particularized friendship does not necessarily mean less affective depth or less self-sacrifice in modern friendships. Specialized friendships are characteristic of modern society but not inherently less rewarding.

SIMMEL ON THE DIVISION OF LABOR

According to Simmel, the emergence of increasing division of labor is associated with the appearance of the middle class. The cohesion of simple societies is fragile because each component is able to survive independently and is able to do what every other can do. In contrast, complex societies are united by the division of labor — their cohesion

> . . .rests on the division of labor. The disruption of the group would leave each individual quite helpless. Thus, division of labor with its linking of individuals to each other works against variability in case this would harmfully affect the maintenance of the group (Simmel, 1898-99:43).

The increased division of labor is thus related to two phenomena in society - one the distinct individuated multi-group memberships discussed earlier and the other the enslavement of men to technology.

In Simmel's dialectic, man is under constant threat from his own creations. Whether society is capitalistic or socialistic, man is endangered. Etzkorn (1968:2) refers to this as Simmel's "dialectic between life and more-than-life."

Simmel saw man not as a sum total of roles but as a whole which is divided into roles by modern society. The "fetishism" of economic commodities which Marx described is only a small part of a larger and more total estrangement of man from all his products. Although the division of labor facilitates art, science, law and religion and enables individuals to have autonomy and self-purpose, technology goes beyond necessity and produces a wide-range of artificial demands. This is man's cultural predicament. In science there is the proliferation of unnecessary knowledge, in the fine arts technique is emphasized over art. Hence, there is extreme specialization of division of labor (Simmel, 1958:42-43). This results in a fundamental duality between the cultural meaning and the substantive meaning of objects.

Simmel's modern alienation is the separation of the creation from man the creator. Man's products are reifed. As Coser succinctly puts it, "the producer can no longer find himself within his product; rather, he loses himself in it" (Coser, 1965:22). Man is oppressed, in Simmel's view, by his own cultural products and the division of labor acts to accentuate this tendency.

SIMMEL ON URBANIZATION

Simmel's influential paper "Metropolis and Mental Life" (1950) provides a clear exposition of his image of urban man and it was this image which became a model for the early work of the Chicago school. Simmel, as Tönnies had earlier, saw urban life in sharp contrast to what he perceived to be the nature of rural life. In the city there is an emphasis on exchange, it is the hub of the money economy. The intellect dominates and often there is "inconsiderate hardness" in the approach. In contrast, in rural life

> . . .the rhythm of life and sensory mental imagery flows more slowly, more habitually, and more evenly. Precisely in this connection the sophisticated character of metropolitan psychic life becomes understandable - as over against small town life which rests more upon deeply felt and emotional relationships (Simmel, 1950:410, emphasis added).

Simmel's analysis of urban man bears startling similarities to Tönnies' Gesellschaft personality.[10] Simmel, like Tönnies, saw rational, calculating behavior as inconsistent with interpersonal warmth. There is near anti-intellectualism in his assertion that in the urban setting man's reactions have "shifted to that organ which is least sensitive and quite remote from the depth of the personality. . . the head" (Simmel, 1950:411). In contrast to his negative assessment of rationality, emotionalism is equated with interpersonal responsiveness and positive warmth. Simmel did not consider the possibilities of warm, emotional anger, hatred, or malicious intent.

In some sense, Simmel may be seen as predating the often expressed concerns of today's computerized society. Simmel saw man in the early twentieth century treated like a number. Urban man calculates with his customers, his merchants, his servants and often his close associates. Money is at the root of social evils. Simmel (1950:412) cited with approbation the observation of an unnamed historian that

"London has never acted as England's heart but often as England's intellect and always as her moneybag."

The city is characterized by extreme impersonality and a blasé attitude. The senses are over-assaulted and this results in an inability to react to new sensations with the appropriate energy. The resulting blasé attitude, characteristic even of the metropolitan child, is an aspect of self-preservation in a hyperstimulating environment. However, in the process of devaluating the objective world, one's personal sense of worth also becomes devaluated. The outward reserve of urban man is not just a protective shield. According to Simmel (1950:415):

> . . . if I do not deceive myself, the inner aspect of this outer reserve is not only indifference but more often than we are aware, it is a slight aversion, a mutual strangeness and repulsion, which will break into hatred and fight at the moment of a closer contact, however caused.

The result of this is that urban man experiences "brevity and scarcity of interhuman contacts. . . as compared with social intercourse in the small town" (Simmel, 1950:421).[11]

Simmel sees the small town in idyllic contrast to the city. Here is a place where "one knows almost everybody one meets and where one has a positive relation to almost everyone" (Simmel, 1950:415). Simmel's portrait of the rural man is that of the happy, simple and loving peasant. Simmel's pastoralist inclinations are very pronounced in this article. The social life of rural settings may be simple but it is characterized by "good" interpersonal relationships.

SUMMARY: SIMMEL'S VIEW OF TRADITIONAL AND MODERN SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

Simmel, as did Tönnies in Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft, engaged in his share of armchair philosophizing. As a consequence (and in contrast to Durkheim) the supportive documentation throughout Simmel's work is glaringly insufficient. This is particularly frustrating in view of the fact that many insightful and thought-provoking observations are found in his writings. Most of these observations are phrased in the form of assertions when they would far better satisfy the rules of evidence if put in hypothetical form. This characteristic of Simmel's writing together with his reputation as a popular public speaker probably well illustrates the difficulties of attempting to please two audiences - the layman and the specialist.

Ortega y Gasset (Coser, 1971:199) once characterized Simmel as something of an "intellectual squirrel" engaging in thrilling acrobatic leaps from branch to branch and nut to nut, but never exploring for long the full potential of any one of them. It is interesting that Simmel's article on the city which is particularly an argument ad hominem in contrast to some of his other work (e.g., on the dwindling influence of the family) is the one which attracted the urban researchers of the University of Chicago. Pastoralist imagery runs rampant throughout this particular paper.

Simmel's work, based as it was on limited documentation, reflects some of the same problems as the earlier writers discussed, Tönnies in particular. Simmel's writing on life in the city was impressionistic. He treated city life as uniform, did not allow for or examine variations in urban influence and assumed (without supportive data) a socially rewarding pre-urban existence. His work relied heavily on his own cultural perspective. Although he made sporadic use of historical examples, he did not make use of historical documents and materials. His position gave little consideration to the nuances of differential gender socialization and the relevance this might have to interpersonal ties in urban industrial areas.[12]

Table 9 summarizes Simmel's view of traditional and modern social relationships. Simmel saw the individuality and freedom of modern life as both advantageous and disadvantageous. The movement from kin to non-kin groups, greater group memberships, the greater involvement with specialized groups, the lesser likelihood of overlap in group memberships and the role specific interactions which he saw as characteristic of modern social encounters are described and evaluated rather neutrally. In contrast to Tönnies, Simmel claimed that role specific interactions were not of necessity any less rewarding than generalized, role-encompassing, encounters. The characteristics described in his article "The City and Mental Life" form the basic components of his more dour view of modern urban social life. He clearly viewed these components with concern. In the city, inter-human contacts are scarce, there is impersonality, the money economy dominates, relationships are calculated and profit oriented and a blasé attitude prevails towards ones fellow human beings. In Simmel's eyes, modern urban residents suffer a depletion in socio-emotional rewards.

Table 10 specifies the sources of socio-emotional support in modern and traditional societies as viewed by Simmel. Family, religion, neighborhood, occupational and geographical ties are weakened.

TABLE 9

SIMMEL: CHARACTERISTICS OF TRADITIONAL AND MODERN SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

CHARACTERISTIC	Traditional Society	Evaluation of Contribution	Modern Society	Evaluation of Contribution
Blood related	Common	Neutral	Uncommon	Neutral
Extended duration	Common	Positive	Diminished	Negative
Role pervasive	Present	Neutral	Uncommon	Neutral
Emotional/ non-rational	Present	Positive	Diminished	Negative
Number of Group Memberships	Few	Neutral	Many	Neutral
Individual freedom	Weak	Neutral	Strong	Neutral to Positive
Indifference (blasé attitude)	Absent	Positive	Common	Negative

TABLE 10

SIMMEL: SOURCES OF EMOTIONAL SUPPORT IN TRADITIONAL AND MODERN SOCIETIES

Support Source	Traditional Society	Evaluation of Contribution	Modern Society	Evaluation of Contribution
Conjugal ties	Weaker	Neutral	Strengthened	Neutral
Kin ties	Strong	Neutral	Weakened	Neutral
Religious ties	Strong	Neutral	Weakened	Neutral
Neighborhood ties	Strong	Neutral	Weakened	Neutral
Occupational ties	Strong	Neutral	Weakened	Neutral
Friendship	Generalized	Neutral	Specific	Neutral
Geographic ties	Strong	Neutral	Weakened	Neutral
Special interest groups	Few	Neutral	Many	Neutral

This weakening results in large part from the previous strength of the family which traditionally pervaded all of these groups. The only support ties which have become stronger are those of the marital dyad and special interest groups. Friendship has changed, become more specialized, and may or may not be qualitatively better for it. Simmel did not consistently lament the weakening of these previous ties of support. However, his characterization of lack of community in his discussion of urban life reflected a concern for those lacking sufficient social support. Simmel's position was not altogether consistent in his various writings, and as mentioned previously, it is his article on the city which is most notable for its clear enumeration of the negative correlates of urbanism.

Table 11 illustrates Simmel's view of the characteristics of the traditional and modern family. The family has lost many of its earlier characteristics. Shared property, residence, religion, tradition, and economic cooperation have all decreased within the family. The basic strength remaining is the "physiological," i.e., the gradual turnover of membership in the family unit (a feature which is to the advantage of any enduring group). There has been a shift from the broader family to an emphasis on the conjugal unit. This unit becomes the focus of greater socio-emotional expectations as individuals seek out someone with whom to share self-disclosure.

Table 12 summarizes the major characteristics which Simmel saw as influencing the quality of an interpersonal relationship. In his analysis of modern and traditional relationships Simmel (at times inconsistently) assumed that (a) relationships based upon emotionalism/

TABLE 11

SIMMEL: TRADITIONAL AND MODERN FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO INTER-PERSONAL LIFE

CHARACTERISTIC	Traditional Society	Evaluation of Contribution	Modern Society	Evaluation of Contribution
Common property	Present	Positive	Absent	Neutral
Common residence	Present	Positive	Absent	Neutral
Reciprocal help	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined
Status conferal	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined
Inculcation of tradition	Present	Positive	Absent	Neutral
Economic cooperation	Present	Positive	Absent	Neutral
Conjugal emphasis	Less	Neutral	More	Neutral
Conjugal self-revelation	Less	Neutral	More	Positive
Unit of social control	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined	Not Examined
Shared religious bonds	Present	Positive	Absent	Neutral
Physiological factors (gradual replacement of membership)	Present	Positive	Present	Positive

TABLE 12

SIMMEL: SUMMARY OF MAJOR INFLUENCES ON INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS AND EVALUATION OF THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO A RELATIONSHIP

Positively Evaluated Influences	Neutrally Evaluated Influences	Negatively Evaluated Influences
Emotionalism/spontaneity	Blood kin ties	Rationality/intellectuality
Extended duration	Marital ties	Indifference (blasé attitude)
Reciprocal self-revelation	Role pervasive	Brevity of relationship
Small numerical involvement	Role specific	Urban life
Rural life	Number of group memberships	
	Overlap of group memberships	

spontaneity are superior to those based on intellect/rationality; (b) relationships which endure are superior to relationships of short duration; (c) the numerical component is important to a relationship, small numbers of people promote better relationships; (d) reciprocal self-revelation is preferable to an attitude of impersonality; and (e) rural life is superior to urban life. The specificity or pervasiveness of a relationship and the number and amount of overlap of group memberships are of less concern to Simmel's view of the "good relationship."

This concludes the examination of the work of Simmel. Chapter Four will compare his work with that of Durkheim and Tönnies. We will examine the extent to which and the manner in which these three major European theorists shared important assumptions in their examinations of urban industrial social bonds, assumptions whose ramifications may have reached well into the twentieth century.

CHAPTER THREE

FOOTNOTES

1. Hinkle (1960) suggests that the depression years in the United States facilitated an appreciation for Durkheim's work. There was a state of apprehension about the vitality of the social order.

> With the complacency of prosperity shattered, sociologists were compelled to recognize that the conditions of social order could no longer be assumed. The crisis raised the question of social integration, solidarity, unity, or order as crucial, central problems (Hinkle, 1960:281).

This provides interesting parallels to Marx's newfound respectability among American sociologists as one of the aftermaths of the turbulence of the decade of the sixties.

2. Durkheim suggests that the extreme division of labor between the sexes has worked to the disadvantage of both.

> . . .has not the division of labor, in its historical development, been carried to the last stage in the relations of men and women? Have not there been faculties completely lost by both? Why cannot the same phenomenon occur between individuals of the same sex? Of course, it takes time for the organism to adapt itself to these changes, but we do not see why a day should come when this adaptation would become impossible. . . (Durkheim, 1933:401).

3. Wolff (1960:70-71n) notes that Durkheim in his family course (conducted around 1892) took the position that the monogamous conjugal family unit was becoming stronger in the face of the decreasing functions of broader kin groupings.

4. There is little space in Durkheim's paradigm for competition much less for conflict. All the many criticisms of a concensus approach become salient in viewing Durkheim's assumptions regarding a rewarding relationship (e.g., Adams, 1966; Horton, 1966; Cohen, 1968; Williams, 1966).

5. Simmel lectured as a privatdozent for fifteen years. In this low status position, his income was dependent on payments from students. In 1900 he was appointed Ausserordentlicher Professor — an honorary but academically powerless position. It was not until the age of 56, four years before his death, that he was given a full professorship. Simmel, in correspondence with Weber, suggested that the reason for his failure to gain an appointment at Heidelberg in 1908 was due to the fact that

"in certain circles the idea exists that I am an exclusively critical, even a destructive spirit, and that my lectures lead one only to negation. Perhaps I don't have to tell you that this is a nasty untruth" (Wolff, 1950:xix, quoting correspondence).

6. Sorokin observed that what Simmel lacked in scientific method he made up for in imagination.

> Simmel's method entirely lacks either experimental approach, quantitative investigation, or any systematic factual study of the discussed phenomena. . . what there is represents only the speculative generalization of a talented man, backed by the 'method of illustration' in the form of two or three facts incidentally taken and often one-sidedly interpreted. Without Simmel's talent the same stuff would appear poor. Simmel's talent saves the situation but only as far as talent compensates for lack of scientific methodology (Sorokin, 1928).

7. Given that this analysis is based on translated sources, it is necessary to acknowledge the problems of such materials. The judgments of the translator in interpreting the writer and the meaning of his writing at the time of its inception must be accepted and these are sometimes very idiosyncratic - leaving more than a mild feeling of unease. For example, Simmel's term Vergesellschaftung was translated as socialization by Small and Spykman, translated as societalization by Abel and sociation by Wolff (see Wolff, 1960: lxiii). Still another example of the difficulty of judging the intended meaning of words is illustrated in the following two translations of the same sentence in Simmel's Soziologie:

> (1) "The number of different circles in which individuals move is one of the indices of cultural development." Translator: L. Coser (Coser, 1965:19).
>
> (2) "The number of different social groups in which the individual participates is one of the earmarks of culture." Translator: R. Bendix (Simmel, 1955:138).

In addition to the problem concerning the accuracy of translated materials, reliance upon sources which have reached the stage of translation raises questions regarding the representativeness of the selections. Given that our interest in this study is in specific aspects of each theorist's approach and not with a broad exposition of his contributions, we have not aimed to present a total picture of the theorist's work. While the writings of Tönnies and Durkheim which focused on urban industrial social bonding were easier to delineate, Simmel's work, apart from his specific article "Metropolis and Mental Life," presents more of a problem. However, sufficient materials seem to be available to make a composite assessment of his position on this issue.

In addition, it might be added that Everett C. Hughes has argued (whether validly or not) that the danger of mistaking a portion of a man's work, which is available in translation, for the whole is less likely when using the translated writings of Simmel than would be the case with many other scholars. In Hughes (1955:8) words, this is because Simmel's "style of thought shines clearly through in nearly every piece of his writing, even in many of the smaller essays which he wrote for magazines and for the feature sections of newspapers."

8. This analysis of Simmel's position relied on several primary sources in English translation. A major article (one which served as the stimulus for much urban research) was the widely translated "Metropolis and Mental Life" (1964). Other early works consulted were Simmels articles in the American Journal of Sociology which were translated by Albion Small (Simmel, 1898a; 1898b; 1898-99; 1902-03; 1905; 1906; 1909; 1910), the eight selections from his writings which appeared in Park and Burgess' 1921 textbook (Simmel, 1969 a through j) and more recent translation, The Sociology of Georg Simmel translated by Kurt Wolff (1950), Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliations translated by Kurt Wolff and Reinhard Bendix (1955) and Georg Simmel: The Conflict in Modern Culture and Other Essays, translated by K. Peter Etzkorn (1968).

Another important source used was Spykman's (1925) exposition of Simmel's work, The Social Theory of Georg Simmel. Spykman gathered selections of Simmel's work from several sources and arranged portions of them under common headings. These sections are written as translations not as interpretations. Spykman carefully acknowledged their origins and reserved interpretative comments for footnotes. Hence, while Spykman's work is not a translation in the usual sense neither is it a secondary source in the ordinary sense. Although the general problem with translated sources was pointed out in the preceding footnote, a personal comparison between selections in Spykman's work and the counterpart discussion in another work specifically labeled as a translation (Simmel, 1955) suggests Spykman's fidelity to the original Simmel text.

9. Simmel's use of the term "form" is possibly more accurately conveyed by the term social structure (Wolff, 1960; Coser, 1965).

10. Simmel's anti-urbanism comes through extremely clearly in this paper and there is less play of the dialectic in his analysis of metropolitan life. This article has a one-sided fervor not found, in our opinion, in many of his other works. It is interesting that the Chicago school regarded this as a major contribution to the analysis of urban social life. Simmel's article apparently found fertile soil in the acknowledged reformist tendencies of many of the early Chicago staff.

11. In another place Simmel made the interesting observation that modern culture is not without its element of faith. In contrast to primitive life

> in a richer and larger cultural life. . . existence depends on a thousand premises which the single individual cannot trace and verify to their roots at all, but must take on faith. Our modern life is based to a much larger extent than is usually realized upon the faith in the honesty of each other. Examples are our economy, which becomes more and more a credit economy, or our science, in which most scholars must use innumerable results of other scientists which they cannot explain. We base our gravest decisions on a complex system of conceptions, most of which presuppose the confidence that we will not be betrayed (Simmel, 1950:313).

This insightful statement is not expanded upon. It rests in among countless others. Needless to say, it is not part of the classic "Metropolis and Mental Life" and is an observation not elaborated by following urban researchers.

12. The adequacy of Simmel's observations within his own culture may be questioned. Heberle notes that Simmel scarcely used "the rich sources of socio-economic surveys, dissertations, and semi-official inquiries which. . .resulted from the influence of the historical school in economics in Germany" (Heberle, 1965:120). Even Everett C. Hughes (1955:8), in an apologia for Simmel, agrees with critics that Simmel never proved anything by empirical test.

CHAPTER FOUR

TÖNNIES, DURKHEIM AND SIMMEL: SOME SHARED AND DIVERGENT ASSUMPTIONS

INTRODUCTION

Chapters Two and Three concentrated on the work of three European theorists which evidence suggests was influential in the development of orientations toward the sociological study of social bonding in modern societies. We have attempted to sketch some of the important intellectual antecedents of ideas which may still have currency in this area of study. Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel each made significant contributions to the legacy of sociological thought. Many years ago, Schopenhauer remarked that, "It is much easier to point out the faults and errors in the work of a great mind than to give a distinct and full exposition of its value" (Bierstedt, 1973). While acknowledging this, it must still be recognized that each of the three writers surveyed was most assuredly a product of an intellectual era. In many ways they shared common intellectual backgrounds, a common intellectual climate and a common network of ideas; the development of their work was constrained by this, some to a greater extent than others. Criticism from the vantage point of some seventy or more years of disciplinary development is still essential to our current research concerns, to the extent that these writers continue to exert practical influence on the field. We have yet to develop an adequate theory of modern primary relationships or an organized format for research which might lead to such theoretical advance. An examination of the intellectual legacy of men such as

Durkheim, Tönnies and Simmel involves at least two major aspects: one which focuses on the influence of their explicit concepts and frameworks and a second whose focus is on the impact of the more implicit assumptions which guided the work of these European theorists. Our major interest is in the latter.

Assumptions are the taken for granted, the untested. However they are not necessarily the untestable. We have singled out for examination assumptions which we see as potentially problematic. They are problematic not because they are erroneous but because the failure to treat them as empirical questions subject to test has, we suspect, had important ramifications for the progress of the study of modern social bonds. The validity of this suggestion, of course, can only be evaluated after the exposition of our total argument. Using as a base the preceding examination of specific aspects of the work of Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel, we have isolated nine assumptions which we see of critical importance. These assumptions and their relevance to the work of these European theorists will be summarized below.

EXAMINATION OF THE ASSUMPTIONS

1. The assumption that rural interpersonal relationships are superior to urban interpersonal relationships

Simmel and Tönnies were similar and extreme in their high regard for the presumed virtues of rural life. Simmel's (1950) influential article, "Metropolis and Mental Life" was suffused with pastoralist imagery. Similarly, Tönnies' pro-rural views were apparent throughout Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft. Simmel and Tönnies were consistent in portraying rural social life as a form of encompassing positive warmth. They did not differentiate between types of rural life. Ruralism was highly valued and the interpersonal qualities which they held in esteem were blanketly ascribed to rural settings. By contrast, Durkheim was much more cautious in characterizing differences between rural and urban social relationships. Durkheim's interpretation of urban social life and the implications of this for a characterization of rural life were tempered by his more sensitive cross-cultural perspective. Of the three European forefathers, Durkheim stood apart in his careful avoidance of a value stance openly supportive of rural social life.

2. The assumed superiority of emotional in contrast to rational interpersonal relationships

Simmel and Tönnies each took an almost anti-intellectual view regarding the merits of emotional/spontaneous as opposed to rational/intellectual interaction. Tönnies (1957) highly evaluated the non-rational and "warm" spontaneity of Gemeinschaft natural will, and both he and Simmel (1950:211) appeared to assume that a spontaneous emotional relationship was in some way more "sincere" than one which was carefully considered. Durkheim was more cautious about making this conclusion. However, in The Division of Labor he made a passing remark equating the supposedly greater intellectuality of the city with an increase in mental disorders (Durkheim, 1933:273). In contrast to Durkheim, Simmel and Tönnies were consistent in judging intellectuality and rationality as less desirable influences on a social relationship than emotionalism and spontaneity.

3. The assumed superiority of role generalized as opposed to role specific relationships

The attribute of role generalization is part of the standard definition of a primary relationship in modern sociology. However, Tönnies (1957:226) was the only one of the three European theorists to cite role generalized relationships as emotionally superior to the role specific relationships of the varied interest groups which characterized Gesellschaft society. Durkheim did not discuss this issue. However, in contrast to Tönnies' position, Simmel pointed out that the differentiation and specialization of modern interpersonal relationships need not necessarily mean that these relationships are more emotionally shallow or less rewarding than those which are more diffuse.

4. The assumption of the superiority of enduring relationships in contrast to transitory relationships

Another characteristic frequently associated with current definitions of the primary group is that of durability. All three of the European writers examined, Durkheim, Tönnies and Simmel, were in general agreement in assuming that relationships extending over time were superior to those of short duration.

5. The assumed validity of generalizations derived from unrepresentative categories

Durkheim and Simmel made generalizations about the behavior of humankind which did not distinguish between status-role positions. Thus class, age and sex differences were not sufficiently considered. In contrast, Tönnies attempted with his two types of will to explain differentials between age groups, social class and gender groups regarding attachments to friends and family.

Simmel and Durkheim were particularly prone to assume the sufficiency of data regarding single gender (i.e., male) behavior for the explanation of human behavior and to assume that the behaviors more commonly associated with the male role were the defining features of a given society. The failure to adequately differentiate between gender groups, social class and age/life-cycle differences did not inhibit these writers from presuming to make generalizations about humankind.

6. The assumption that urbanism and industrialism are static phenomena

Neither Tönnies, Durkheim nor Simmel differentiated between forms of industrialism or the process of industrialization. Although Durkheim suggested in a brief footnote that there might be cultural variations in the manifestation of industrialization, he did not expand upon this or provide guidelines for analysis (see Fletcher, 1971). Durkheim, in equating the division of labor with industrialization, did not consider a society such as India which had, in the caste system, extreme division of labor without industrialization.

Similarly neither Durkheim, Tönnies nor Simmel differentiated between urbanization as a process and urbanism as a condition. Variant types of urbanism were not considered by Tönnies or Simmel. Although Tönnies admitted to the possibility of Gemeinschaft qualities in some urban sectors, he did not see these as characteristic of urban life. Durkheim, in contrast, had a broader view of urbanism which encompassed the possibility of cross-cultural variation in urban settings; this did not extend, however, to his analysis of industrialism. Although the three European theorists attributed major social behaviors to the industrialization and/or urbanization of society, their analyses of these phenomena tended to be static.

7. The assumption of a unidirectional path to modernity

A common assumption characterizing the work of all three European theorists was that diverse forms of humankind would react similarly to the processes creating modernity. Once people had been swept up by these processes they would tend to emerge in uniform fashion. Large scale change of traditional society through massive industrialization and/or complex division of labor was assumed to have uniform predictable consequences. Although Durkheim allowed for cross-cultural variation in the impact of urbanism, the division of labor which was his focal independent variable was seen as producing characteristic social consequences. The general assumption of Tönnies, Simmel, and Durkheim of a unidirectional path to modernity implied the relative irrelevancy of the prior history of a people and assumed the inability of such people to control and direct their own development. The dominant thrust of Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel was that traditional societies would be inevitably transformed with a resulting global unity of the human condition.

8. The assumed sufficiency of an ahistorical analysis

Although the three European theorists examined, given their interest in issues involving broad long range societal change, of necessity took a historical perspective, their analyses were decidedly ahistorical. Durkheim made the most frequent acknowledgment of secondary historical sources of the three. However, even in the situations where limited historical documentation was provided these theorists did not engage in historical analysis. Although both Tönnies and Durkheim had been influenced by the legal historians (e.g., Maine and von Gierke) Tönnies drew sporadically upon historical data. In large part, Tönnies deduced his theory from his broad principles of will. His avowed interest was in interpretations based on the present (Tönnies, 1957: 235).[1]

Simmel, although he had studied under some famous historians of his time (see Coser, 1965), made casual, undocumented references to historical "facts." He dealt with social change without a rigorous reliance and evaluation of historical materials. None of these three theorists engaged in historiography or historical scholarship. Historical materials were not subjected to critical examination but were instead brought in to illustrate a point upon occasion. These writers relied upon the convenience of non-random historical support for their theories. This can be seen in some respects as an aspect of the then on-going attempt to distinguish sociology from history.[2] However, these three theorists (and in particular, Tönnies and Simmel) assumed the sufficiency of their broad based generalizations unsupported by historical analyses.

9. The assumed adequacy of culture-bound data

While allowing that the nineteenth century did not possess the wide base of ethnographic and cross-cultural materials which comparatively speaking is available today, the work of Tönnies and Simmel made minimal use of cross-cultural materials. Tönnies' use was very limited and Simmel gave the least attention to cross-cultural materials, reflecting the general lack of rigor in his approach. Durkheim attempted to make use of ethnographic data and hence his observations were less exclusively based upon western Europe or western European peasantry. However, despite the insufficiency of their data, this did not inhibit these writers from making sweeping generalizations about societal change and its interpersonal impact.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The preceding nine assumptions are differentially present in the work of the three European theorists examined. Table 13 provides a summary examination of the position of each theorist. It can be seen that these assumptions were most prevalent in the work of Tönnies and Simmel. Durkheim was more cautious in making such assumptions. Only three of the nine assumptions were found to operate in the examined writings of Durkheim. At the same time, however, Durkheim did not clearly disengage himself from most of the remaining untested assumptions found in the work of the other two theorists. In fact, of the nine assumptions, only two were clearly rejected at some point by an individual theorist. Durkheim rejected the assumed superiority of rural social relationships over urban social relationships and Simmel rejected the assumed superiority of role generalized relationships over role specific relationships. The nine assumptions discussed were present in much of the important work on urban industrial social bonding previously examined. These are assumptions which we feel have important impli-

TABLE 13

TÖNNIES, DURKHEIM AND SIMMEL: COMPARISON OF SHARED AND DIVERGENT ASSUMPTIONS

Assumption		Theorist	
	Tönnies	Simmel	Durkheim
1. Superiority of rural social relationships	X	X	—
2. Superiority of emotionalism	X	X	?
3. Superiority of role generalized relationships	X	—	0
4. Superiority of enduring relationships	X	X	X
5. Validity of unrepresentative sample	?	X	X
6. Static nature of urbanism and industrialism	X	X	?
7. Unidirectional path to modernity	X	X	X
8. Suffiency of ahistorical analyses	X	X	?
9. Adequacy of culture-bound data	X	X	?

X = acceptance of the assumption

— = rejection of the assumption

? = partial acceptance and partial rejection of the assumption

0 = not discussed.

cations for the research process. They will serve as analytic categories for examining the possible and continuing repercussions of the work of Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel in twentieth century sociology. The extent to which these assumptions or their variants have continued to recur is central to our total study.

CHAPTER FOUR

FOOTNOTES

1. Tönnies (1957:235) had noted:

> In contradistinction to all historical theory deducing its findings from the past, we take as our actual, even necessary, starting point that moment in history when the present spectator enjoys the inestimable advantage of observing the occurring events in the light of his own experience, and perceives, although chained to the rocks of time, the approach of Occeanus' daughters.

2. Simmel's interpreter and apologist, Spykman (1925:267), criticized the tendency during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century to focus on evolutionism and the accumulations of the past rather than generating predictions from the present. According to Spykman, "During this period the social sciences, and especially sociology, have suffered from an overemphasis on the historical dimension." Spykman saw what critics termed Simmel's "neglect of the historical dimension" as being, in fact, "A valuable contribution, if only as a reaction against the one-sided emphasis on historical development in the social sciences in the nineteenth century."

CHAPTER FIVE

THE CLASSICIST APPROACH TO SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN URBAN INDUSTRIAL SETTINGS

INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapters discussed the European heritage concerning the social implications of societal development and change, with particular reference to Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel. In twentieth century North America, the sociological study of the interpersonal implications of urbanization and industrialization gradually bifurcated into two distinct sub-fields: family sociology and urban sociology. Specifically family research examined and discussed changes in the nature of familial social support. Urban research examined the social relationships of the city. Although specialized debates developed within these two subfields, they shared a common interest in the impact of urbanism and industrialism on interpersonal ties.

Until approximately the decade of the '50's, a common stance, which will be designated as the "classicist approach," was taken in much of the research literature on both kin and extra-kin support ties. This approach argued that the social support ties of modern humankind were greatly attenuated. Family members were cut-off from the wide range of kin support which was believed to have been available at an earlier period in time. Urban residents were characterized by feelings of anonymity and social isolation not experienced by their rural counterparts. Many of the issues discussed by the European writers were also reflected in the literature in this area. The extent to which some of the assumptions detailed in chapter four also made their way into the North American literature has yet to be critically examined.

This chapter will deal with major arguments and evidence of the "classical approach" as it developed in American sociology. The first section of the chapter will focus primarily on research in the area of urban sociology, while the latter section will focus on the classical approach as manifested in specialized studies on the family. Some of the research to be discussed overlaps with the interests of both subfields. Such overlap is consistent with their shared question: to what extent can it be said that urban industrial interpersonal relationships are significantly different and significantly less rewarding than those of an earlier and/or less complex period?

THE CLASSICIST APPROACH AND EXTRA-KIN RELATIONSHIPS

It is commonly recognized that the ground swell of interest in the sociology of the city originated at the University of Chicago during the 1920's and 1930's. The Department of Sociology was established there in 1892 and was the first such department in the United States. By the 1920's it held a position of near dominance in American sociology. The pre-eminence of the University of Chicago during this period means that its sociologists must play a major role in the discussion of the classical approach. However, an understanding of the important influence of this school and its graduates necessitates an appreciation for the rather unique combination of men and circumstance which contributed to its intellectual character.

The city of Chicago provided a stimulating milieu which would probably have been difficult for students of the social to ignore. Chicago was undergoing rapid expansion with wave after wave of immigrants and rural migrants flooding into its boundaries. Its burgeoning population increased by about half a million new inhabitants each decade. In 1860 the city numbered 112,172 inhabitants; by 1900 this had grown to 1,698,575; in 1910 the number had reached 2,185,283; ten years later it reached 2,701,705 and by 1930 it was listed at 3,376,438 (Stein, 1960:16). Chicago developed many distinct ethnic neighborhoods. The new arrivals not only experienced the problems of adjusting to a different culture, but they also had to cope with prejudice, discrimination and substandard conditions of housing, education and employment. A gamut of social problems seemed to characterize Chicago urban life. The meliorative inclinations of some of the Chicago sociologists, several of whom were former clergymen or sons of clergymen (Faris, 1967) formed a sometimes shaky reapproachment with their desire for scientific objectivity. Ernest Burgess, in describing this period, stated that

> . . . although the objective was scientific, behind it lay a faith or hope that this scientific analysis would help dispel prejudice and injustice and ultimately would lead to an improvement in the lot of slum dwellers (Burgess and Bogue, 1964:5).

The research projects of the Chicago school gravitated toward the social problems of the city and its apparent disorganization. The consequences of this emphasis were far reaching as will be later discussed.

The addition of Robert E. Park (1864-1944) to the Chicago faculty in 1914 is usually seen as the beginning of the monumental program of urban studies for which this department became so well recognized (Burgess and Bogue, 1964, 1964; Faris, 1966:26).[1] Park was a former newspaperman who had worked for several years with Booker T. Washington in the Negro movement and had been, for a time at least, a self-acknowledged reformer (Park, 1973:254). He did his graduate work at Harvard, Berlin, Strassberg and Heidelberg. Park had studied with Simmel and credited Simmel with having given him a "fundamental point of view for the study of the newspaper and society" (Park, 1973:256). He noted that "with the exception of Simmel's lectures, I never had any systematic instruction in sociology" (Park, 1973:257). As previously mentioned, Simmel's work was highly praised in Park and Burgess' book An Introduction to the Science of Sociology.[2] Several observers are in agreement that Simmel's influence is apparent throughout this book (e.g., Faris, 1967). The compatibility between Parks' and Simmel's views regarding the nature of urban social relationships is also reflected in an article Park published in the March 1915 issue of The American Journal of Sociology. This article was to have major impact on subsequent urban research.

Park's article, entitled "The City: Some Suggestions for the Study of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment," contained an extensive listing of research proposals which became, according to one of Park's former students, Everett C. Hughes, "the research program of Park himself, of his students, and of many colleagues in other fields as well as in sociology; a program realized, in part, in The Hobo, The Gold Coast and the Slum, The Ghetto, The Gang, and other studies of city types and city areas" (Hughes, 1952:5-6). Park's article has been referred to by Sennett as a "landmark in the development of urban studies (which) has influenced the course of urban research in America and Europe ever since" (Sennett, 1969:13).

Park's article was rich with research suggestions and pointed to problem areas in need of study. He suggested that the study of cities would profit from the anthropological techniques in use at that time by men such as Franz Boas and R.J. Lowie. His suggestion for ethnographic research in the city was adopted by many of the urban sociologists of the period and characterized much of the Chicago research (a technique which has since been largely abandoned to anthropologists). Park was interested in the proportional characteristics of urban populations, factors contributing to city growth, the patterns of urban growth and the impact of the division of labor. He suggested, for example, the study of the stock exchange and the mob, geographic mobility, types of residence, the characteristics of various ethnic, social class and occupation groups such as the clairvoyant, the bartender and the plumber. He proposed the study of neighborhoods and, in this sense, was suggesting a comparative study within the city itself (in contrast to the work of Durkheim, Tönnies and Simmel which directly compared the city with the countryside). Park was interested in the factors increasing and decreasing the cohesion of neighborhoods. Park's article reflected his interest in the city as a "moral order." According to Park ". . .the city possesses a moral as well as a physical organization and these two mutually interact in characteristic ways to mold and modify one another" (Park, 1969:93).

Park's intrigue with the differences between urban occupations, neighborhoods and ethnic groups and his interest in intra-city comparisons were colored by his assumptions about the social ties of the city in contrast to non-urban areas. His frequent co-author, Burgess, commented that "we assumed that the city had a characteristic organization and way of life that differentiated it from rural communities" (Burgess and Bogue, 1964:70). Many of these assumptions are similar to the empirically unsubstantiated themes suggested by Park's mentor, Georg Simmel. The city was seen by Park as providing less "authentic" socio-emotional support than the countryside. In Park's view:

> Touch and sight, physical contact, are the basis for the first and most elementary human relationships. Mother and child, husband and wife, father and son, master and servant, kinsman and neighbor, minister, physician and teacher - these are the most intimate and real relationships of life, and in the small community they are practically inclusive (Park, 1969:111) (emphasis added).

Secondary social ties were seen as replacing primary ties. Park saw city growth "accompanied by the substitution of indirect, 'secondary' for direct, face-to-face 'primary' relations in the association of individuals in the community" (Park, 1967:110). While transportation and communication multiply the contacts between people, these contacts are more "transitory and less stable." People meet but do not "know" one another (Park, 1967:125). With the weakening of intimate primary relationships the moral order resting upon them is "gradually dissolved" (Park, 1967:111).

Park's high evaluation of emotionalism and non-intellectualism is reflected in his observation that the small community where social ties are more "intimate," "real" and "stable" is characterized by interaction which is "immediate and unreflecting." Interaction is largely based upon instinct and feeling rather than rationality (Park, 1967:111).

In Park's view the city's "disintegrating influence" had changed the nature of church, school and family. The urban family lost some of its functions to the school. The church lost its influence. In Park's view

> . . . it is probably the breakdown of local attachments and the weakening of restraints and inhibitions of the primary group, under the influence of the urban environment, which are largely responsible for the increase of vice and crime in great cities (Park, 1967:112).

Park thus presented a picture of modern urban life bereft of interpersonal supports and notably deficient in contrast to the socio-emotional rewards of its rural counterpart.

Although Park's article on the city as a social laboratory specified a program of research, initially there was little funding available for very elaborate projects. Hence from 1916 to 1923 Park and Burgess both regularly sent classes out to observe the city. Map making activities flourished, with students making spot maps and rate maps and plotting the distribution of characteristics of the city. These observations on Chicago neighborhoods, institutions and natural areas often crystallized into term papers, which became theses and, in some cases, eventually books.[3] The first such book was Nels Anderson's The Hobo, published in 1923. For the next two decades, almost two dozen books appeared covering various aspects of city life. After 1923, research was aided by an elaborate funding operation intended to promote urban research on Chicago.[4]

The early work in urban sociology borrowed from plant and animal ecology. Symbiosis, invasion, succession, natural forces and natural areas were part of the theoretical and conceptual framework of Park, Burgess and their colleague, R.D. MacKenzie. Burgess, building upon

Park's interest in natural areas, postulated the concentric zone hypothesis as an analytic device to characterize regularities in the spatial distributions of people, services and facilities in an urban area.[5] He saw this as representing "an ideal construction of the tendencies of any town or city to expand radially from its central business district" (Burgess, 1925:50). Burgess' view was that land use organizes around the point of highest concentration of population and commercial activity, the downtown business district. The central business district thus dominates much of the economic, political and social life of the area. Subsidiary areas may be staked in concentric circles around the central business district. Each of these five zonal areas of the city has characteristic features and is distinguished from adjacent zones. These zones are (1) the central business district of downtown hotels, department stores, banks, and city offices with a dense daytime population; (2) the zone of transition, an interstitial area characterized by low rents, cheap rooming houses, light industry and hence social disorganization, crime and delinquency; (3) the zone of workingmen's homes with low to medium rentals, some partially assimilated immigrant's flats, inexpensive apartments and old single dwellings; (4) the residential zone of better apartments and exclusive areas with high rents; and (5) the commuters zone, an area of varying width which surrounds the city proper.

Many of the ethnographies of urban life in Chiago carried a copy of Burgess' (1925) diagram of the concentric zones of the city, with the apparent intent of relating ecology and ethnography. However, the authors of these monographs did not make extensive use of ecological concepts. They often by-passed explanations derived from ecologically based formulations to focus on sometimes implicit and often unsystematic social psychological explanations. These books stamped their unique imprint on urban research. Some of these works will be examined in the pages following. It should be emphasized that the intention is not to provide an exposition and evaluation of the total argument in each one of these monographs. The focus will be specifically upon their treatment of urban interpersonal relationships. This information will provide part of the base for examining the thrust of the classical approach.

Nels Anderson's The Hobo (1923) was the first book published in the Chicago monograph series sponsored by Robert Park. This book, written by a man who had had some personal experience as a transient, was basically a description of the effects of extreme mobility and separation from involvement in conventional society. Anderson's characterization of the interpersonal life of the "homeless men" of Chicago is distinguished by an assumption that transient relationships are necessarily less satisfying than their opposite. This is not treated as a question subject to empirical examination but as an established truth. One effect is that this assumption colors the interpretation given to the interpersonal relationships of the hoboes. Hence their "common law" marriages (Anderson, 1923:142) and their homosexual relationships which might last for several weeks while on the road (Anderson, 1923:147) are not examined in terms of possible socio-emotional rewards and interpersonal support they might provide for the participants. Anderson's study emphasizes urban disorganization and its assumed manifestations in the lives of these men even in the face of evidence which might be rallied to support an opposing position. For example, Anderson writes

> Every city has its district into which these homeless types gravitate. . . to the homeless men it is home for there, no matter how sorry his lot, he can find those who will understand. The veteran of the road finds other veterans; the old man finds the aged; . . . the radical, the optimist, the inebriate, all find others here to tune in with them. The wanderer finds friends here or enemies, but, and that is at once a characteristic and pathetic feature of Hobohemia, they are friends and enemies only for the day. They meet and pass on (Anderson, 1923:4)(emphasis added).

Whether they are based on personal disorganization or mere unconventionality, the above short-lived intense relationships are categorically dismissed, in the absence of confirming evidence, as possible sources of socio-emotional rewards and support. A careful examination of the implications of these short-lived, unconventional and "deviant" forms of urban social relationships appears to have been deflected by Anderson's dominant assumption that transitory relationships do not provide adequate interpersonal rewards.

Harvey Zorbaugh's The Gold Coast and the Slum, first published in 1929, is a study of various types of slum dwellers and the inhabitants of the expensive hotel and apartment hotel areas of Chicago. This was a widely circulated book which became a best seller (Faris, 1967:83). In this work Zorbaugh vacillates between specific and generalizing references to "the city," although his data were derived from Chicago. This makes it difficult to determine his intended level of generalization. However clear his personal conception may have been, this clarity is not reflected in his work. To illustrate, in the following quotation Zorbaugh asserts that for a large proportion of the residents of "the city" there is

> . . . a dissolution of social solidarity and public opinion. Face-to-face and intimate relationships in local areas are replaced by casual, transitory, disinterested contacts. There arises an extreme individuation of personal behavior . . . (Zorbaugh, 1929:251).

Whether or not the above generalization was intended for Chicago or cities in general is not clear. However, the impression given is that it is intended to encompass city life in general as Zorbaugh supports his contention by an anecdotal example of life in New York City.

In Zorbaugh's view, the anonymity of city life is reflected in the fact that people do not know their neighbors (1929:65) and that contacts become increasingly secondary. The movement from the boarding house to the rooming house reflects the spreading loneliness and anonymity of city life (1929:75). Chicago's bohemian area, Towertown, exhibits the disorganization which attends disintegration of group sanctions and tolerance for unconventional behavior. Zorbaugh denies the existence of community ties within the bohemian area by virtue of its short-lived and promiscuous contacts. This is a feature which he sees as increasingly characteristic of the city as a whole.

The slums, in Zorbaugh's view, are characterized by "well defined types of submerged humanity" (1929:129). Many recent immigrants inhabit the slum. Family life suffers in such settings:

> In practically every immigrant group. . . the family is going to pieces in the conflict with an alien culture. The fact that there is no occupational continuity and tradition within the family, that the child tends to follow a different trade from that of his father, and is taken into a world of different values, materially contributes to this conflict and disintegration (Zorbaugh, 1929:188-189).

Zorbaugh, in fact, cites the upper class family in the Gold Coast area as the only one functioning as an institution; that is, in the manner of the family in a "village community" (1929:181). Generally speaking, however, "communities of the type of the peasant village of Europe, or the early American town, are not found in the modern city" (1929:227). In re-emphasizing the virtues of the community of the upper class, at the conclusion of his book Zorbaugh claims that the hope for organized action to improve the city rests with this group.

Zorbaugh's book makes interesting reading; however, it is limited by sub-cultural and class-based definitions of "good" family life, "good" friendship and "good" community. What others may well characterize as cultural differences, for example the close friendships of males of Persian and Greek descent, Zorbaugh perceives as examples of social disorganization and family disintegration (1929:189). While characterizing the slum family as disorganized, his work gives evidence of strong family control over Sicilian girls and great warmth toward parents in the Sicilian family. While citing evidence of apparent disorganization in Chicago's bohemian area, Zorbaugh might well have used some of the same data to argue examples of community. While describing the slums as places of freedom, individualism, disintegration and disorganization, he does not reconcile this with his own examples of slum dwellers who frustrate "do-gooders" by rejecting their attempts to remove them from their slum surroundings. (Zorbaugh's (1929:135) attempted explanation for this is that "the person's behavior becomes conditional upon stimuli of slum life. Without these familiar stimuli, the person becomes restless, lonely, uncontrollable.") In sum, Zorbaugh fails to adequately examine the disconfirming potential in some of his own evidence regarding his general characterization of interpersonal relationships in the city.

Ruth Shonle Cavan's book Suicide was published in 1928. Surprisingly, given Durkheim's esteem among sociologists today, it contains only one reference to Durkheim's work of the same title. While acknowledging cultural differences in definitions of suicide (with no conceptual reliance on Durkheim), Cavan sees suicide as generally disapproved in Europe and America. Rates are low in small towns and rural areas because of traditional attitudes toward suicide and "because there is little occasion for confusion of interests and purposes" (Cavan, 1928:330).

In contrast we again find urban areas portrayed as centres of interpersonal malaise. In Cavan's words they

> . . .tend to be in a perpetual state of disorganization and the multiplicity of contacts and diverse codes of conduct permit liberation of the individual from traditional ways of thinking and at the same time often make it almost impossible for him to achieve satisfactory relationships for fulfillment of his interest (Cavan, 1928:330).

Cavan views the modern urban society as moving away from the protection provided by small isolated groups. To fill the social vacuum created by city life and reduce the risk of self-destruction, Cavan suggests the creation of social welfare agencies as a substitute for the protection provided in non-urban settings. Further, Cavan assumes throughout that the urban dweller lacks satisfactory relationships because of multiple and heterogeneous contacts in the city. While Cavan's suggestion regarding the protective role of social welfare agencies may be valid, her general assumption that multiple and heterogeneous contacts in the city preclude the development of satisfactory relationships lacks adequate empirical support.

Still another book dealing with problems in the city is Walter Reckless' (1933) Vice in Chicago. Reckless' book deals with prostitution.

He describes a change in the nature of prostitution from the organized brothel types to an increase in semi-professional and amateur prostitution. These changes in the form and nature of prostitution are seen as linked to aspects of urban society. Reckless lists a variety of factors contributing to the incidence of prostitution; however, it is his characterization of urban interpersonal life which is of issue here. Reckless cites the following factors as influencing the occurrence of prostitution,

> . . . the rapid growth of Chicago; the decline of the old form of local community life; the decay of neighborhoods; the problems of adjustment of incoming peoples without families; Negroes and immigrants from abroad; the development of transportation facilities including the automobile; the changes in the status of women; the development of mechanized living conditions in apartments; the growth of leisure and the declining influences of the home and neighborhood (Reckless, 1933:271).

Vice in Chicago contains documentary data and case histories regarding the distribution of prostitution in Chicago and the life of the prostitute. A major assertion in the book is that prostitution is influenced by such characteristics of the urban setting as the decreased influence of the family and neighborhood. While Reckless may be correct concerning the influential role which the family and neighborhood play, he does not provide adequate empirical evidence concerning the decline of family and neighborhood and their dynamic relationship to prostitution. Reckless' book provides another illustration of the social scientist's readiness to casually attribute negative qualities to city life.

Faris and Dunham's book Mental Disorders in Urban Areas, first published in 1939, is an ecological and statistical examination of rates of hospitalization for mental disorders. Faris and Dunham found high rates of some mental disorders in the presumably disorganized areas of the city of Chicago. The ten highest rates were in the central hobo, roominghouse and slum areas. Lowest rates were in residential districts on or near the edge of the city. Their success in plotting such rates varied by type of illness. However, it is Faris and Dunham's view of urban interpersonal relationships which is of interest to our thesis. Diversity is singled out and assumed to be a threat to mental health.

> The slum area populated by heterogeneous foreign-born elements forms a chaotic background of conflicting and shifting standards, against which it is quite difficult for a person to develop a stable mental organization. Disharmony in family life is likely to be frequent in interracial and intercultural marriages. Conflict between family life and neighborhood influences is common. Continuity of tradition and of life-experiences is more rare (Faris and Dunham, 1960:158-159).

It seems clear to Faris and Dunham that urban ethnic heterogeneity exerts a negative influence on mental stability. However, the study does not take into account the role of selective factors in residential patterning which might have had a more determining influence on mental stability than ethnic heterogeneity. The important critical remark here is that Faris and Dunham's study has asserted rather than demonstrated that "negative" qualities of urban life, e.g., ethnic heterogeneity, are responsible for certain types of mental illness.

Frederick Milton Thrasher's book The Gang, first published in 1927, attempted to examine 1,313 gangs in the city of Chicago. Using Burgess' concentric zone hypothesis, Thrasher found gangs to be generally located in the "zone of transition" (the poverty belt surrounding the central business district of the city). Thrasher (1927:33) attributes gang life to disorganization - the "disintegration of family life, inefficiency of schools, formalism and externality of religion, corruption and indifference in local politics which mean the failure of controls for the boy." Park (1927:vii) notes in his preface to Thrasher's book that gangs are not characteristic of the city alone, for they may also be found in villages. However, operating throughout the book is Thrasher's assumption of the major impact of urban disorganization.

> It is not because the boys of the middle and wealthier classes are native white that they do not form gangs but because their lives are organized and stabilized for them by American traditions, customs and institutions to which the children of immigrants do not have adequate access (Thrasher, 1927:152).

Thrasher's affinity with an assimilationist perspective is reflected in the above quotation. While avoiding the attribution of biological inadequacy, Thrasher manages to see immigrant group cultures as faulty within the new environment. To him, gangs are a manifestation of cultural conflict.

While Thrasher attributes gang behavior to urban disorganization and cultural conflict, there are possible discrepancies in his data which are not examined. He has evidence suggesting, for example, the family solidarity of Italian immigrants (Thrasher, 1927:142). He observes that girls rarely engage in gang behavior due to the fact that "they are usually well incorporated into the family groups" (1927:152). He neglects to analyze the type of family which is disorganized for boys and at the same time organized for girls.

Similarly, while seeing disorganization as characteristic of immigrant groups, he acknowledges that common nationality provides an additional solidarity for some gangs in areas where one nationality group predominates. Thrasher describes the gang as a primary group (1927:202), possessing tradition, esprit de corps, solidarity and morale

(1927:46). Yet, at the same time, Thrasher pictures these gangs as having "little permanence" (1927:31) and in "a condition of unstable equilibrium" (1927:32). Short (19:xxi) has pointed out that Thrasher's data often seem "confusing" and "contradictory." Thrasher neglects to analytically reconcile his view of the gang as a primary group with his characterization of urban disorganization. In addition, he disregards an examination of how his data suggestive of ethnic solidarity and "successfully" socialized females articulate with a disorganized urban environment.

A book which discusses _strong_ ties in one area of the city of Chicago is Louis Wirth's book _The Ghetto_, published in 1928. Based upon his doctoral dissertation, this book discusses the role of Jewish immigrants in Chicago and their past experience in European ghettos. Wirth sees the ghetto of sociological interest as a phenomenon associated with various immigrant groups. The ghetto community is closely knit with strong controls, strong support ties, assistance given to new immigrants and strong family units (Wirth, 1928:222).

Wirth sees the Jewish immigrant moving out through the concentric zones forming the city from the slum core to the zone of workingmen's homes (Wirth, 1928:247). In moving from the ghetto the second generation becomes "pre-eminently an area of conflict - conflict within the family and the community. Families tend to disintegrate under the stress of contradictions between behavior patterns which result from the importation of extraneous cultural influences into the home by the children of the immigrants" (Wirth, 1928:253-254). At the same time Wirth acknowledges that ". . . in their attempt to flee from the ghetto, the partially assimilated groups have found that the ghetto has followed them to their new quarters" (Wirth, 1928:254-255). These ghetto areas are a prelude to assimilation. It becomes most difficult to reconcile Wirth's description of the close knit ties of the ghetto (which he sees as also characterizing other settlements of immigrants such as the Italians and Chinese) with his later, influential, 1938 article on "Urbanism as a Way of Life" which detailed the anonymity of the city. The key perhaps lies in the assumption of eventual assimilation which dominated many of the descriptions of immigrant life in the works of this period. If close ties existed, they were assumed to be a passing characteristic of certain ethnic groups in the city, hence not an urban phenonmenon. Further, it was assumed that immigrants would assimilate and assimilation would be accompanied by the "natural" characteristics of urban social life. Some implications of this assimilationist assumption will be detailed in chapter six.

Robert Park retired in 1933. At that time, according to Everett C. Hughes, (Short, 1971:xxxix n) "the mantle of the student of cities" fell upon the shoulders of Louis Wirth. Wirth (1897-1952) was to be a major figure in urban sociology. Born in Germany, Wirth did both his graduate and undergraduate work at the University of Chicago.[6] He taught at this same university continuously from 1931 until his early death in 1952. Wirth's principal works include the previously mentioned book The Ghetto (1928) and articles on urbanism, minority relations and the history of social thought. Wirth seemed to have had a unique ability to develop concept definitions which became widely accepted by his fellow sociologists. His definition of minority group (Wirth, 1945) and his definition of the city (Wirth, 1969) have each had major influence in their respective areas (Dewey, 1960; Newman, 1973).

Wirth's previously discussed work, The Ghetto, depicted the close knit community and family life of the urban Jewish ghetto. This stands in sharp contrast to Wirth's more frequently cited article "Urbanism as a Way of Life" which was published ten years later in 1938. This article integrated and in a way personified the work of the Chicago school regarding urban social bonds. In it Wirth drew a characterization of urban anonymity and diminished social ties which was clearly reminiscent of Simmel.

Wirth attempted in his article to develop a "sociologically significant" definition of the city by singling out the distinctive components of urbanism. The definition which Wirth proposed emphasized the ecological determinants of a city and his hypothesis was that these had sociological consequences. Wirth defined the city as "a relatively large, dense, and permanent settlement of socially heterogeneous individuals" (Wirth, 1957:50). His criteria for an adequate definition were that it "not only denote the essential characteristics which all cities - at least those in our culture - have in common but should lend itself to the discovery of their variations (Wirth, 1957:49). Initially Wirth had noted

> In formulating a definition of the city it is necessary to exercise caution in order to avoid identifying urbanism as a way of life with any specific locally or historically conditioned cultural influences which, while they may significantly affect the specific character of the community, are not the essential determinants of its character as a city (Wirth, 1957:50).

Wirth recognized the problems of definitions which relied upon numbers or density and (having been one of the few of these early writers to apparently benefit from exposure to Weber) he acknowledged the importance of differing commercial and social characteristics of cities.[7] Thus he cautioned against equating urbanism with industrialism and modern capitalism and assured his reader that he viewed urban-industrial and rural-folk societies as ideal type communities.[8] Additionally he noted that urban social life is influenced by rural traditions and inhabitants originating from rural backgrounds, "Hence we should not expect to find abrupt and discontinuous variations between urban and rural types of personality" (Wirth, 1957:47).

Despite these initial qualifications, Wirth's eventual generalizations regarding urban social characteristics show the major influence of Georg Simmel (Faris, 1967; Abu-Lughod, 1968). According to Wirth, the social relationships of urban life are segmented. While there may be a greater amount of contact between more people in relation to the number of people met, the number of people known is small.

> The contacts of the city may indeed be face to face, but they are nevertheless impersonal superficial, transitory, and segmental. The reserve, the indifference, and the blase outlook which urbanites manifest in their relationships may thus be regarded as devices for immunizing themselves against the personal claims and expectations of others (Wirth, 1957:54).

In Wirth's view, the rational and calculating urban dweller sees other people as a means to an end. Social relationships are superficial, anonymous and of short-duration. The individual may gain freedom from group control but he loses "the spontaneous self-expression, the morale, and the sense of participation that comes from living in an integrated society" (Wirth, 1957:54). Wirth saw this as personifying Durkheim's idea of anomie, hence the social disorganization of technological society.

Wirth saw competition, self-aggrandizement and reciprocal exploitation as the end results of depersonalized high density. "Frequent close physical contact, coupled with great social distance, accentuates the reserve of unattached individuals toward one another and unless compensated by other opportunities for response, gives rise to loneliness" (Wirth, 1957:56).

Additionally, Wirth also saw urbanization as working against traditional family life. Although he did not examine the marital bond, Wirth saw the kinship bonds as weakened with many family functions having been lost to specialized institutions.

In spite of his qualifications in the early part of his article, Wirth seemed to forego caution in his attempt to discover the forms of action and social organization that emerge out of the conditions forming his definition of the city and which could be interpreted as transcending cultural and temporal differences. Wirth neglected to specify what qualifiers, if any, he placed on the social characteristics he saw as associated with urbanism. It is difficult to determine from his article exactly what locale he had in mind in his characterization of urbanism as a way of life. Even if we assumed that his generalizations were intended solely for North American cities, many questions could be raised regarding their applicability to even this limited locale. Certainly with respect to the use of Wirth's famous article by subsequent writers, his generalizations have usually been ascribed to urbanism *per se*. Wirth's characterization of urban loneliness and anonymity have played an important role in the field of urban sociology. This frequently cited article has served as a focal point for the classicist approach to extra-kin relations.

The pioneering work of the Chicago school focused on life in the city yet implicit throughout their publications was an underlying consensus regarding the presumed nature of pre-urban life. This view took practical and influential form in the ethnographic work of Robert Redfield. Though labelled an anthropologist, Redfield was a writer whose influence crossed disciplinary lines and whose work and typologies contributed to the intellectual climate surrounding the urban research of the thirties and forties. Redfield studied at the University of Chicago at the time when sociology and anthropology were still encompassed within one department. His training, almost equally divided between the two fields, (Faris, 1967:100) culminated with a Ph.D. in 1928 and a dissertation entitled, "A Plan for the Study of Tepoztlan, Mexico." Redfield, a son-in-law of Robert Park, had entered anthropology upon Park's encouragement. Park was apparently a moving force in interesting Redfield in the idea of ideal types (Redfield, 1955:143; Faris, 1967:101) and Redfield's book Folk Culture of Yucatan (1941) is dedicated to Park. Although Redfield was an anthropologist, he published in both anthropological and sociological journals and his work on societal typologies was widely recognized by sociologists. His studies of rural Mexico, which made heavy use of the folk-urban dichotomy for the organization and interpretation of data, can, in some ways, be viewed as an application of the techniques and many of the assumptions which operated in the ethnographic studies of the city of Chicago. In this manner, Redfield continued and expanded upon the tradition of negative evaluations of urban social life portrayed in the classicist approach.

Redfield's first book, Tepoztlan: A Mexican Village (1930) was based on his doctoral dissertation and presents a picture of pre-urban life which is well in line with classicist assumptions. In reading the book one is struck by the apparent tranquility of life and even death in this small village. Oscar Lewis, with justification, has characterized Redfield's early book in the following manner:

> The impression given by Redfield's study of Tepoztlan is that of a relatively homogeneous, isolated, smoothly functioning and well-integrated society made up of a contented and well-adjusted people. His picture of the village has a Rousseauan quality which glosses lightly over evidence of violence, disruption, cruelty, disease, suffering and maladjustment. We are told little of poverty, economic problems or political schisms. Throughout his study we find an emphasis upon the cooperative and unifying factors in Tepoztecan society (Lewis, 1951:428-429).

Redfield's book became a classic in community studies. His empirical portrayal of village life was similar to the views regarding pre-urban life which were emphasized by his Chicago mentors. There was little to suggest that the villagers of Tepoztlan might harbor some of the more "negative" human emotions. Although Redfield did not directly formulate his folk-urban typology in this book, and in fact denied later that this was even "in mind" when he did the initial study (Redfield, 1955:135), when his typology did crystallize it was not much different from those previously existing. One could well argue the presence of folk-urban assumptions, in at least fledgling form, in the rather innocuous picture drawn of village life in Tepoztlan.[9] Redfield's Folk Culture of Yucatan (1941) was a well-known early explication of the idea of the folk culture and the evolving folk-urban typology which was characterized by Lewis in 1951 as enjoying "great prestige among sociologists and anthropologists," It was also the work in the Folk Culture of Yucatan which first attracted questions concerning the validity of Redfield's interpretations.

The Folk Culture of Yucatan examined life in four communities on the Yucatan peninsula of Mexico. The smallest of these, Tusik, with a population of 106 in 1930 was homogeneous, non-specialized and isolated; Chan Kom, with a population of 250 was an agricultural community whose populace shared similar backgrounds but less isolation; Dzitas, with a population of 1,200, was a communication centre "on the frontier between the urban and rural ways of life" (Redfield, 1941:430) and lastly, the urban centre of Merida had a heterogeneous population of 96,660 in 1930.

Redfield's typology relied on the key independent variables of isolation, mobility and homogeneity. His intent was to analyze the changes occurring in communities evolving from folk to urban. His was a synchronic study of culture change which made several implicit assumptions about the four communities studied in order to justify treating them as representing a valid historical sequence.[10] These four communities were seen as representing city, town, peasant village and tribal village. His major conclusion in this study was that "the changes in culture that, in Yucatan, appear to 'go along with' lessening isolation and homogeneity are seen to be chiefly three; disorganization of culture, secularization, and individualization" (Redfield, 1941:339).

It was Redfield's contention that an understanding of society - particularly modernized, urbanized society, could be gained from understanding its antithesis - which he saw as the folk society. He set his folk society up as an ideal type - but, as with other ideal types, problems arose which we will specify later. Redfield defined a folk society as

> . . . small, isolated, nonliterate, and homogeneous, with a strong sense of group solidarity. The ways of living are conventionalized into that coherent system which we call a "culture." Behavior is traditional, spontaneous, uncritical, and personal; there is no legislation or habit of experiment and reflection for intellectual ends. Kinship, its relationships and institutions, are the type categories of experience and the familial group is the unit of action. The sacred prevails over the secular; the economy is one of status rather than the market (Redfield, 1947:294).

Thus we have a classicist view of the polar opposite of urban life. The folk society is personal, has group solidarity, strong kinship ties and a mentality among the populace which is emotional rather than analytic.

Although most of the major work of the 1920's and 1930's, in the field of urban sociology, came from the University of Chicago, a discussion of this period should not by-pass the contributions from two Harvard sociologists, Pitirim Sorokin and Carle Zimmerman. Sorokin and Zimmerman published a text Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology in 1929 and together with Charles J. Galpin, three volumes of a massive work, A Systematic Sourcebook in Rural Sociology, between 1930 and 1932. The work of Sorokin and Zimmerman served as a reference for many respected rural sociologists (notably T. Lynn Smith and Charles P. Loomis). The thrust of the Sorokin-Zimmerman position regarding rural-urban interpersonal relationships and the manner in which this meshes with the Chicago approach, call for consideration.

Sorokin and Zimmerman, in contrast to many of the writers previously surveyed, made use of cross-cultural and cross-temporal data. Their sourcebook contains an assortment of such data resulting from fiction writing, general impressions and quantitative techniques. In spite of the variant quality of their sources, they assume that their generalizations are valid across time and place. Thus, they claim:

> Since sociology is interested primarily in the differences that are general in space and relatively constant in time. . . in the past and in the present and in all the rural and urban social worlds. . . we shall take only the differential variables that correspond to these requirements. In other words, those variables that we study are typical not only for this or that particular city and its nearby rural aggregate, but for the city and the country generally whenever and however they occur (Sorokin, Zimmerman and Galprin, 1930:186-187).

Sorokin and Zimmerman develop a basically descriptive formulation and do not explore variables which might act to explain the presumed differences between rural and urban life. They distinguish between rural and urban life on the basis of differences which are "relatively constant and repeated in time and space" (Sorokin and Zimmerman, 1929:15). These differences are in (1) occupation; (2) environment; (3) community size; (4) population density; (5) the socio-physical homogeneity of rural communities in contrast to urban areas; (6) social mobility; (7) the one-sidedness of population migration; (8) the greater differentiation and social stratification in urban areas; and (9) characteristics of social interaction.

It is the presumed differences in the nature of social interaction in rural and urban settings which are of interest to our analysis. Sorokin and Zimmerman view urban areas as distinguished from rural areas by the greater number of social contacts. People are unavoidable in the city and it is difficult to find a place for solitude. In addition to the quantitative difference there are qualitative differences. The interaction in urban areas is characterized by impermanency in contrast to the stability and durability of rural life. Urban contacts are superficial

> . . . in the totality of relations which compose the network of the interaction system of an urban individual, the part composed of casual, superficial, and short-lived relations, in contrast to permanent, strong, and durable relations, occupies a much more conspicuous place than in the interaction system of a rural dweller (Sorokin and Zimmerman, 1929:53).

The urbanite is engaged in fewer face to face interactions. "Only an infinitesimal part of the persons with whom an urban individual interacts are personally known to him; the greater part of them. . . are only 'human abstractions'" (Sorokin *et al.*, 1965:236).

By contrast, in the rural setting there is a prevalence of face to face contacts, personalized relationships, and a generalized knowledge of the individual. Sorokin and Zimmerman emphasize the permanency and pervasiveness of rural relationships. Their positive evaluation of rural interpersonal life is made quite clear. The quantification assumed to be characteristic of urban life means that

> In this sense the interaction system of an urbanite is superficial and quite mechanical. It misses the most important thing, human personality and individuality, or man's heart and soul. The rural interaction system is. . . more filled by an undetached emotional attitude. . . . *It goes more beyond the 'social dress' of a man and comes closer to his heart, soul, or personality* (Sorokin and Zimmerman, 1929:56) (emphasis added).

Given the evaluative tone of the above statement, it is interesting to note that while acknowledging their own rural origins, Sorokin and Zimmerman (1929:vi) claim in their preface that they will not "bother" to evaluate the good or bad in rural life and, in fact, feel that to do so would be inappropriate.

The influence of Georg Simmel is reflected in Sorokin and Zimmerman's position. An adapted version of Simmel's "Metropolis and

Mental Life" was included in the sourcebook and they acclaim Simmel's contribution to knowledge concerning the "city-soul" (Sorokin *et al*., 1965:239). Similarities between their position and Simmel's can be readily found. Although the Sorokin-Zimmerman argument has received less critical attention than the Chicago Park-Wirth approach (Sjoberg, 1964), the positions regarding interpersonal relationships in rural and urban settings are very similar.

In addition to a broad characterization of urban social relationships, the work of the writers surveyed at least touched on aspects of urban family life. In addition, during this same period from the 1920's on, major research in the sociology of the family focusing on the impact of urbanization and/or industrialization added to the classicist argument. As manifested in family studies, this argument took on some distinctive aspects but the unifying issue was still the apparent decline in interpersonal ties in modern society.

THE CLASSICIST APPROACH AND KINSHIP TIES

It will be recalled that many nineteenth century social observers presumed a change in the nature of the modern family. The details of that change and its implications varied from author to author. The three European founding fathers viewed the family in differing ways. Ferdinand Tönnies saw decline in family ties as a characteristic of urban industrialized Gesellschaft society. Those qualities which distinguished the earlier societal form, Gemeinschaft, were the qualities of the family itself. Marital ties were classed along with family ties in general as undergoing a process of weakening. In contrast, Durkheim noted the decreasing functions of the broader kin group (Wolff, 1960: 70-71n), but an increasing strength of the conjugal unit. The task differentiation of modern marriage was seen as adding to its solidarity (Durkheim, 1933:56). Similarly, Georg Simmel saw an erosion of factors leading to kin solidarity due to the fact that such ties as religion and occupation no longer overlap with kinship. However, Simmel felt that modern marriage now carried greater expectations, expectations of intimacy, love and reciprocal self-revelation.

North American writers on the family from the early twenties to the middle part of this century tended to follow closer to the Durkheim-Simmel interpretation of changes in the family, i.e., while family life, in the broad sense, had changed from that of an earlier period, its decreased importance had been offset to some extent by a greater emphasis on the conjugal unit. However, the form of this change in family life, its strength, rewards, gains and losses has been part of an on-going discussion over a period of several decades. The content of the debate regarding the nature of urban industrial kinship ties and the role of conjugal versus consanguineal relationships involves, as Zelditch (1964) has observed, many diverse questions. Some deal with the kinds of interpersonal contact between kin, some deal with the quantity of interpersonal contact and some are concerned with the quality of interpersonal kin contact. However, the controversies have centered around the reputed decline, in one form or another, of the meaning of kinship in industrialized urban societies.

In the United States, by the 1920's, the study of the family had moved from an earlier interest in the origin and evolution of the family to an interest in the contemporary family. A social problems orientation continued to color much of the work in this area but there was increasingly an interest in empirical verification as opposed to solely logical verification (Komarovsky and Waller, 1945). The development and popularity of specialized college courses in marriage and the family encouraged the production of many family textbooks. Not infrequently these had an applied, social problems, orientation with major focus on the marital relationship and correlates of marital success and failure. Apart from the commercialized ventures, there were major writers during this period whose work made a recognizably distinct (as opposed to rather singularly paraphrased) contribution to family studies, some of which dealt with the role of kinship ties in modern society.

The previously discussed work of the Chicago school was an important contribution reflecting the prominent role of Ernest W. Burgess during this period. Burgess was responsible for developing the area of the sociology of the family at Chicago and he had considerable influence on the monographs previously discussed. Still another book in this series, one which focused entirely on the urban family, was by Burgess' first doctoral student, Ernest W. Mowrer. Mowrer's 1924 dissertation (the second doctoral research project on the family in Chicago's history) evolved into a book, Family Disorganization, which was published in 1927. Mowrer's book meshes rather well with Burgess' own views on the urban family which eventually began to appear in book form in the late thirties.

Mowrer (1927:146) credited Park's article "The City" and Simmel's "Metropolis and Mental Life" with providing the basic background for his examination of urban family disorganization. He used court statistics, plot maps, anecdotal newspaper accounts, diaries and a few scattered historical and anthropological references to support his thesis of urban family disorganization. Mowrer's index of disorganization was based on the rates of divorce and desertion (which he referred to as the "poor man's divorce") in the city of Chicago. Rates of desertion were calculated from court records regarding support litigation. Using Burgess' concentric zone scheme, Mowrer divided Chicago into five areas and provided empirical data to illustrate differentials in family disorganization between these areas.[11]

Mowrer saw city life and industrialization as of major impact on the family. Although his specific focus was on the pattern of disorganization in Chicago, his larger reference was to the urban industrial family in general. In Mowrer's view, a combination of factors were assumed to contribute to the likelihood of disorganization in the urban marriage:

(1) Increased social contacts in the city mean a decline of primary group control and a breakdown in morality. Relationships in urban society are casual and anonymous in contrast to rural society. In Mowrer's view (1927:167) "much of the present-day disorganization of the family is the result of this change from primary to secondary relations."

(2) The mobility of city life and the "atomization" of the individual in the city mean still further breakdowns in control and an emphasis on individualism over the collectivity. In contrast, the rural individual was oriented toward the collectivity, the soil and kinship. Urban life has different conditions and "demands" that the individual prove himself

and his own talents.

(3) Industrialization and the removal of the economic function from the home have meant that women are less dependent on their husbands for security.[12] Marriage has changed from providing security to being a vehicle of "response" (particularly for women). The socio-emotional aspects of the marital relationship become paramount.

> Considerations which held the family together in the primary group - status in community, security, the care of children, seem thus of little importance where the romantic ideal becomes the measuring success in marriage (Mowrer, 1927:163-164).

(4) The increased leisure time provided by advanced industrialization brings with it the danger of boredom and monotony. Mowrer emphasizes the dangers of the potential "restlessness" of women in urban industrial settings ". . .a social situation which fails to give wholesome direction to the activities of women" may result in indiscretion and divorce (Mowrer, 1927:156). Mowrer emphasizes the potential danger of a "romantic complex" regarding marital life. Women are seen as susceptible to this and with increased free time may use this time to anguish over marriages that don't seem to meet the romantic ideal.

As with other writers, Mowrer's interpretations rested on assumptions about the nature of urban interpersonal relationships, which, although possibly accurate, were neither put to empirical test nor documented by empirical data. These assumptions, together with Mowrer's emphasis on changing functions of the family and the increased socio-emotional importance of modern marriage, were to be repeated frequently by writers who followed.

The work of William F. Ogburn (1886-1959) included a major and influential analysis of the declining functions of the family and the implications of this decline. Ogburn's work, together with that of Talcott Parsons, is regarded by Zelditch (1964:492) as the most fundamental contribution to the classicist approach. Ogburn had moved from Columbia University to the University of Chicago in 1927. He remained there until his retirement. Appreciation of Ogburn's work by Burgess and other family sociologists is apparent in the great frequency with which his work is cited as an authoritative source.

Ogburn attempted to examine the effect of technological development and industrialization on the family. He distinguished between material culture such as clothing, machinery, and transportation and non-material (or adaptive) culture such as beliefs, attitudes and values. Change in material culture is easier to collectively evaluate while change in the non-material sphere is more difficult and is characterized by lack of agreement and slowness to adapt (Ogburn, 1922). For this reason, there tends to be a culture-lag between these two forms of change. Ogburn's culture-lag hypothesis suggested that the period between the change in one part of culture and a correspondingly full adjustment to this change by the other part of culture is a period of disorganization and readjustment. In such a period of cultural lag, traditional attitudes and values seem to be less effective and, characteristically, there is a disturbed condition. For example, the factory system removed men and women from the productive role of the farm and exposed women to an uncertain situation where neither their roles nor their status were clear.

It was within this framework of cultural lag that Ogburn analyzed the impact of technological development on the modern American family. Ogburn's book, American Marriage and Family Relationships (1928) written with another well known figure in family sociology, Ernest Groves, attributed the current problems within the family and "the widespread disorganization in American family life" to the "machine culture (which) has made the way of the family hard by creating rivaling interests and by diminishing the attraction of the home. Only so far as the family wins back its former place in social routine can we expect any noticeable decrease in family disorganization" (Groves and Ogburn, 1928:121).[13]

Ogburn's subsequent works also reiterated the view of the family as passively reacting to the influence of technological advances.[14] Ogburn attempted in his work with Groves and in later publications to empirically substantiate the loss of family functions. His basic focus was on the family in the United States and he provided large amounts of statistical data illustrating the increase in such extra-familial activities as commercial bread baking and restaurant meals. Ogburn specified seven major functions of the family unit (Ogburn, 1929; Ogburn and Tibbitts, 1934). Each of these functions were seen as having undergone major transformation in the industrial United States family:

(1) The economic function. In Ogburn's view, the colonial home was a sort of factory, the family frequently producing almost all that it consumed. Hence the choice of a marital partner was akin to the choice of a business partner. With mechanization and industrialization the economic unit was removed from the home with wide-ranging results. These included the change in the status of children from economic assets to economic liabilities and the camouflaging of the contributions of

the homemaker role.

(2) The educational function. In Ogburn's view, in colonial times home and farm duties were an important aspect of education. Farm and household duties took a much larger portion of the learning period than formal education in the schools. The modern family has had this function displaced by the formal educational system.

(3) The protective function. According to Ogburn, earlier times were characterized by the dominance of the father and his role in settling disputes. Now the protective functions of the family are assumed by government, the police and the courts. In addition, the familial care of the aged is less common than in earlier times.

(4) The religious function. Much of the religious training of the family and the religious ritual previously performed within the home have now shifted to formalized religious settings.

(5) The recreational function. Whereas once the family unit met the recreational needs of its individual members, these needs are now often met through commercialized means. Thus, theaters, dance halls and commercial sports have replaced much of the earlier recreational role of the family.

(6) The status conferral function. Previously the family name and the status which one derived from that name had great significance (Ogburn and Tibbitts, 1933:662). Now the modern family member carries himself more as an individual and less as a representative of the family name. Family background does less to define one's status in the community.

(7) The affectional function. While the preceding six functions

have tended to shift away from the family, the affectional function not only remains but, due to its new primacy, has come into major focus. The relationships between marital partners and parent and child have an increased importance and emphasis. Although the family had lost many of its previous functions and had shrunk in size, Ogburn (1929:123) asserted that it may be "just as vigorous, just as sound in its reduced size and in the more limited spheres in which it now functions." He did not view increased divorced rates as particularly indicative of a lesser degree of reward in modern marriage. Instead these higher rates "may mean only that certain functions and traditions which once operated to hold even an inharmonious family together have now weakened or disappeared" (Ogburn and Tibbitts, 1933:663). Ogburn assumed that the affectional role has expanded in the vacuum created by the decline of other functions.[15]

Ogburn's major independent variable was industrialization/technological development. He noted that it was generally assumed that city life weakened kin ties, but claimed that his evidence did not indicate a decline in marital relationships - just a changed emphasis. As can be seen, Ogburn was more cautious than some of his contemporaries in equating urban industrialism with interpersonal malaise. Leslie (1967: 236) has observed that although Ogburn was cautious, his work was used by the popular press of the twenties and thirties to "predict complete family disorganization and even the disappearance of the family as a social institution."[16]

The accuracy of Ogburn's analysis may be questioned. He used the American colonial family as a baseline for his measure of change.

Ogburn compared the colonial rural United States with the modern United States with no historical analysis of the social organization of the culture over this time period. Instead, through census and other data, he attributed changes to industrialism, ascribing any apparent differences to industrialization. He intentionally focused on the family in the United States, hence his analysis of his major explanatory variable, industrialization/technological development, was culture-bound. Nevertheless he presumed to be able to adequately examine its familial implications without cross-cultural verification.

Two major works on the Afro-American family appeared in the thirties, The Negro Family in Chicago(1931) and The Negro Family in the United States (1939) both by E. Franklin Frazier, a Chicago graduate. These books repeated the theme of urbanization and industrialization as problematic influences on the family, this time with the focus on the black family. Frazier analyzed the black family under slavery, emancipation and then through the experience of urbanization. Variations in Afro-American family life were attributed to the impact of slavery, racism, economic deprivation and finally urbanization and its threat to peasant stability. Family disorganization followed the rural to urban migration of black people.

> Family desertion has been one of the inevitable consequences of the urbanization of the Negro population. . .(husbands left home and). . .despite their often sincere intention to rejoin their families and the initial loneliness which they experienced in the new world, the city with its varied interests proved fatal to family ties. Even when whole families migrated, the community of interests and bonds of sympathy that created strong family ties in rural communities have often been unable to withstand the disintegrating forces of the city (Frazier, 1938:245).

Frazier, as the first major analyst of the black family, saw acculturation, the adoption of the dominant white culture, as the panacea for its apparent disorganization.[17] Frazier's assimilationist perspective was paralleled by Ernest Burgess' introduction to Frazier's book in which he assumed the merging of black and white family forms. According to Burgess, Frazier's book clearly demonstrated "the instability and disorganization of the family under the stress and strain of urban conditions and. . . the forces at work in its reorganization in an equalitarian form in orientation to the urban way of life" (Burgess, 1938:viii).

The name of Ernest Watson Burgess (1886-1966) has reoccurred throughout our discussion of the classicist approach. His work in urban sociology with Robert E. Park, the concentric zone hypothesis, and his influence on many of the Chicago monographs were previously discussed. Burgess was not only responsible for the development of the sociological study of the family at the University of Chicago (Faris, 1967:26), but was a major impetus for the general upsurge of interest in the internal dynamics of family life (Christensen, 1964:9). As early as 1929, Burgess had commented on the decreased functions within the family and the general change in emphasis in family life.

> Historically. . . the family has lost one by one its original collective activities, until the question may be raised whether the modern family is any longer an institution. Is it now anything more than a mere unity of interacting personalities (Burgess, 1929:121)?

Burgess and Cottrell's (1939) study Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage was one of the first major quantitative studies in sociology. Burgess and Cottrell cited Ogburn's data to support their argument that the modern family was characterized by decreased functions but increased emphasis on affection/companionship and child rearing. Major modern technological conditions were equated with urbanism (Burgess and Locke, 1939:6-7) and family problems were seen as, in large part, responses to the transition from rural to urban.

> The family at present is in a process of adjustment to changes . . . which may perhaps best be summed up by the use of the term 'urbanization.' Nowhere has the influence of urbanization been more profound than in the fields of child care, marital adjustment, and attitudes toward sex (Burgess and Cottrell, 1939:7).

Although Burgess and Cottrell attributed such changes to urbanization they did little to empirically support this claim. Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage was a landmark quantitative study (which because of its novelty had to proceed without much benefit from previously established methodological guidelines). However, their data relating to urbanism (cf. pp. 85-86) were neither sufficient nor consistent enough to support their claim that urbanization had played such a profound role.[18]

Another major contribution by Burgess to the study of the family was his widely recognized textbook with Harvey Locke, The Family: From Institution to Companionship (1945). As suggested in the title, this book stressed Burgess' view that the role of the family was changing from one institutionalized in law, tradition and ritual, to one based upon companionship, personality relationships, affection and understanding. Although the examples are drawn basically from the city of Chicago, the work specifically focuses on the American family.

The degree to which a family is "urbanized" may vary with spatial zone of the city, social class, religion, race and national origin (1945:144). Burgess and Locke distinguish between family types and spatial distribution following the concentric zone hypothesis. This distinction is basically the same as that made by Mowrer (1932) in his book on family disorganization which was discussed previously. These areas and their family characteristics are: (1) the "non-family" central business district - the area of homeless men; (2) the rooming-house district with its emancipated family; (3) the semi-patriarchal family in new immigrant settlements; (4) the patricentric family in the area of working men's homes; (5) the equalitarian families in the apartment houses; and finally (6) the matricentric commuter suburbs (Burgess and Locke (1945:24). Additionally, throughout the city there may be scattered "non-family" or quasi-family groups, e.g., unmarried, divorced or widowed people living singly, or in pairs, threesomes or larger groups (Burgess and Locke, 1945:145).

Three factors influence the nature of urban family life: (1) industrialization; (2) the movement from rural areas; and (3) the greater number of impersonal, formal and disinterested relationships in urban areas in contrast to the intimate, spontaneous, relationships of rural areas. Thus the rural mores which regulate family life break down in urban settings and there are great changes involving both disorganization and eventual reorganization (1945:142-143). Basically, where there are exceptions to this, these are not considered to be characteristic of urbanism. Thus while recognizing that there may be initially less family estrangement in immigrant areas (Burgess and Locke, 1945: 115-116) this is not seen as a characteristic of urbanism but as a characteristic of lingering ruralism (1945:127).

The farm family is assumed to come much closer than the urban family to approximating the ideal type of familialism.[19] Hence the farm family is assumed to have greater (1) feelings of belongingness; (2) integration of individual and collective goals; (3) common property and support; (4) willingness to defend members against outsiders; and (5) concern with family stability as evidenced by assisting an adult child in his own economic and household beginnings (Burgess and Locke, 1945:59).

It was Talcott Parsons (1902-) who took Ogburn's thesis regarding the decreased functions of the urban industrial family one step further and proposed and popularized the idea of the "isolated nuclear family." Although, as has been seen, the phrase itself did not represent any startling intellectual departure from the climate of thought regarding the modern family from the nineteenth century onward, Parsons' work is probably the most commonly cited to represent the general classicist position regarding the family.

Parsons' work covers an expanse of several decades. Some authors (e.g., Martindale, 1960) have argued that Parsons' eventual structural-functional approach represented a departure from a theme of social behaviorism in his first book, The Structure of Social Action (1937). Others have argued (e.g., Loomis and Loomis, 1961) that there is no difference in Parsons' approach over time but rather a shift in levels of analysis. Parsons claims that his theoretical outlook has not changed much but rather has gone through a process of continuing elaboration (Black, 1961). His argument on the family, however, has resulted in similar interpretive problems.

Parsons' position on the family developed, in large part, over a fifteen year period.[20] His initial paper on this topic was published in The American Anthropologist in 1943. It had the very specific title, "The Kinship System of the Contemporary United States." This was partly a technical examination of bilateral kindred in general, noting that under such kinship systems, the nuclear unit becomes structurally isolated from the extended family. The aspect of his argument which attracted and held the attention of sociologists, however, was his view that the structural isolation of the conjugal unit was intimately associated with industrialization. The ramifications of this thesis and its subsequent elaboration were crucial to the classicist argument.

In this article Parsons (1943:185) specified that his thesis of the isolated nuclear family was based on the middle class in the United States. In contrast to this group, the upper class family may emphasize status, continuity and ancestral home. The lower class in Parsons view does not allow for much extended kin solidarity.

> There is evidence that in lower class situations, in different ways both rural and urban, there is another type of deviance from this main kinship pattern. This type is connected with a strong tendency to instability of marriage and a "mother-centered" type of family structure - found both in Negro and white population elements. It would not disturb the multilineal symmetry of the system but would favor a very different type of conjugal family, even if it tended to be nearly as isolated as the main type from other kinship groups (Parsons, 1943:185-186).

There has been a round of controversy concerning how broadly Parsons intended his generalizations, i.e., was he referring to the industrial family in general, to the United States family in particular, or to the middle class family in the United States specifically? (See Winch, 1968 and Gibson, 1972.) The position taken is dependent on the particular Parsonian article used to support one's interpretations. In a later article, Parsons (1949:186) was referring to the "focal American type of kinship structure (as) most conspicuously developed in the urban middle class areas of the society." By 1955, when Parsons' book on the family, co-authored with Robert Bales, was published, his theoretical sweep had again apparently shifted. In Family, Socialization and Interaction Process, Parsons was discussing family functions in highly differentiated societies (1955:10) and his argument covered the industrial family in general.

> It is above all the presence of the modern occupational system and its mode of articulation with the family which accounts for the difference between the modern, especially American, kinship system and any found in non-literate or even peasant societies (Parsons and Bales, 1955:11).

Parsons' view of the family coincided with Ogburn's view of the family as a passive agent reacting to outside forces of change. The industrialized economy has major ramifications for the family unit. There is necessarily an emphasis, according to Parsons, on achievement over ascription. Jobs are held by individuals not by family members. The universalism of the modern industrial society is in stark contrast to the traditional ascriptive emphasis of kinship systems. The nature of modern industrial society means that the occupational system requires geographic and social mobility. If individuals were attached to extended kin ties they would be handicapped in their mobility and this, in turn, handicaps the industrial society. Marriage thus becomes the keystone of the modern kinship system. Neolocal residence and loyalties to spouse and children outweigh loyalties to parents and siblings. Romantic love replaces the network of role prescriptions from the extended family.

According to Parsons, the family is intimately tied to the occupational system and the job of the father/husband is the most important determinant of family status. This job puts him in a competitive role outside the home. There tends to be role specialized behavior within the family along instrumental-expressive lines and this contributes to stability. If the wife had an equally competitive role in the occupational world, in Parsons' view, this might well be destructive to the marriage. Consequently, even if the wife works, her job, at least in the middle classes, is usually lower in status and monetary reward. Hence, the husband is able to retain his role as instrumental leader.

The potential geographic and social mobility of the nuclear unit together with its separation from extended kin demands, means that the family has become specialized. Although as it has compressed and lost many previous functions, it now focuses on two functions,

> . . .the basic and irreducible functions of the family are two; first, the primary socialization of children so that they can truly become members of the society into which they have been born; second, the stabilization of the adult personalities of the population of the society (Parsons and Bales, 1955:16-17).

The increased emphasis on "personality functions" may be reflected in family disorganization, but it is part of a "transition" period (Parsons and Bales, 1955:4). Parsons is in agreement with Ogburn that increased rates of divorce do not necessarily reflect a decrease in the importance of the family.

As indicated earlier, it is difficult to judge the extent of Parsons' claim regarding the existence of the isolated nuclear family. It is small cause for wonder the interpretations of his work have varied.

Parsons, by implication, assumes that pre-industrial family life in the United States was quite different from the isolated nuclear family of the twentieth century. He does not provide historical data to support this point. Nor does he specify the identifying components of the social and/or physical isolation of the nuclear unit which would facilitate empirical test of his claim.

The focus until now has been on the work of sociologists; however the position of Ralph Linton, an anthropologist, needs to be considered. Linton's (1949) article on the modern family is a recognized contribution to the classicist position and has been frequently cited and reprinted. Linton saw the modern family as significantly different from its pre-industrial, pre-urban counterpart. In modern society "all familial functions are concentrated in the conjugal group, which is surrounded by a fringe of loosely attached and intermittently operative relatives" (Linton, 1949:38). Both urbanization and industrialization are seen as related to the new emphasis on the conjugal unit. Urban societies of ancient civilizations also experienced, according to Linton, "breakdown of kin ties and of the close social integration of individuals" (Linton, 1949:47). The new additive in the situation of modern societies is industrialization. People can survive independently of the family. The family has been "stripped" of many of the functions which once reinforced bonds between mates. The loss of the economic function was crucially important. Not only are urban social relations casual and diffuse, with a resulting deficiency of social control, but now people see less need for the family.

In Linton's view, however, the family unit is needed for child socialization and the basic function of the conjugal unit in urban-industrial society is "that of satisfying the psychological needs of the individuals who enter the marital relationships. These needs may be summarized as those for affection, for security and for perfected emotional response" (Linton, 1949:49). Thus, increasing divorce rates are not symptomatic of the decreasing importance of marriage, but can be seen instead as indicators that more people are in a position to do something about an unhappy marriage. This may eventually mean a greater number of happier marriages.

Although Linton's article attempted to generalize about "the" family, he did not distinguish between class, ethnic or gender differences and his historical perspective suffered from shallow support.

Carle C. Zimmerman's Family and Civilization (1947) is a work which is outside the dominant trend of sociological writings on the family during this period. Zimmerman's work virtually stands alone because of his historical analysis. He critically examined and evaluated vast amounts of secondary historical data covering some 4,000 years and from this developed a cyclical theory of family change in "civilized societies."

Zimmerman's analysis focused on what he termed "high civilizations" and he worked with the assumption that families of tribal communities were basically irrelevant for the study of modern civilization. In Zimmerman's view "it is doubtful if these peoples are our family predecessors" (1947:92). Additionally, Zimmerman assumed that a family sociology which was appropriate for the study of civilized societies need not differentiate between subcultures.

> The subclassification of civilizations is none of our business, because the family of civilization is completely integrated from time to time and is largely identical (Zimmerman, 1947:118).

Zimmerman saw an interactive relationship between family and societal development. Change follows a cyclical pattern. Three types of family system occur in civilized societies. Each differs according to the amount of power held by the family unit. The first of these is the trustee family which emerges from the primitive state. In this family form the family unit itself is immortal and its members are representatives of the immortal family name. Great power is exerted over members by the husband-father. Power resides within the family and little is delegated to outside agencies such as the state or the church. The absolute nature of this power and its abuse can result in its limitation by state or religious agencies. With the limitation on absolute family power emerges the domestic family form. The domestic family has less control over its members yet sufficient control. In Zimmerman's view it is this family form which is related to the highest form of civilization.[21] However, greater and greater control of family matters by the state leads to its replacement by the atomistic form. This form is manifest in rampant hedonism, high divorce rates, illegitimacy, feminist movements, childlessness and sexual aberations. Familialism is replaced by individualism. Zimmerman predicted that the family in the United States was heading toward the last stages of this cycle. As can be seen, Zimmerman also stood almost alone in his "doomsday" predictions regarding the modern family - if it fails to be redirected.

Zimmerman used data from ancient Greek to modern United States covering some 4,000 years of history. He excluded data from pre-literate groups. Although Zimmerman's work was unique for this period of sociology - standing virtually alone as a sociological historical analysis, and although it attracted attention, its total impact is questionable. Zimmerman's work did not attract a cohort of disciples nor did it stimulate an interest in historical investigations.[22]

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The theme of the isolation of the nuclear unit of husband, wife and children, the insignificance of ties to extended kin, and the articulation of this family form with industrializing society was broadly accepted by family sociologists up until the late 1940's (Sussman and Burchinal, 1968:73). The belief in the decreased numbers of familial functions and the separation of the modern conjugal unit from the variety of kin supports, presumed to be characteristic of pre-industrial and/or pre-urban ties, fit well with the interpretations of the nineteenth century European writers discussed in the chapters preceding. In addition, the Durkheim/Simmel view of increased emphasis on the marital relationships was broadly accepted in family textbooks. This in turn paralleled the classicist approach to non-kin social supports in the city. The totality of the classicist approach was a predominantly lonely picture of modern humankind left with few socio-emotional supports. This was a picture postulated against a background of presumed change from some earlier, more supportive period in human history. We now turn to an examination of the nine assumptions discussed earlier and the relation of these assumptions to the classicist approach to urban industrial social bonds.

CHAPTER FIVE

FOOTNOTES

1. Turner sees Park's influence on a generation of students as very intense. He asserts that "probably no other man has so deeply influenced the direction taken by American empirical sociology as Robert Ezra Park" (Turner, 1967:ix).

2. Prior to the publication of An Introduction to the Science of Sociology, there was little standardization of sociological subject matter. Faris has noted (1967:37) ". . . sociology today has a recognizable connection with this book in a way that it does not have with works of the prominent earlier American writers - Small, Ross, Giddings, and Ward. The direction and content of American sociology after 1921 was mainly set by the Park and Burgess text."

3. Edward Shils (1948), in an interesting monograph aimed toward "explaining" American sociology to British and continental sociologists who had been cut-off from contact with the United States during the years of the second world war, characterized the work of the Chicago school as colorful but woefully atheoretical. Shils (1948:10) describes the monograph series as inadequate in that they "did not set out to demonstrate any explicitly formulated sociological hypothesis; they attempted to illustrate with direct, first hand reports some process or interrelationships. . . ."

Shils attributes this atheoretical orientation to Park's influence. Similarly, Turner cites Park's disenchantment with theorizing. Park, according to Turner (1967:xviii)

> . . .repudiates the practice by which an investigator takes a full-blown theory into the field with him. . . . In one of his most bitter attacks upon quantification, Park stresses the deficiency of a 'purely scholastic exercise in which the answers to all the questions are already implicit in the conception and assumptions with which the inquiry started.'

4. These funding operations, as detailed by Burgess, involved what were, for the era, huge research sums. In 1923, there was an initial sum of $25,000, in the following years $50,000, plus an additional $25,000 if matched by community donations. This was carried on for the next decade (Burgess and Bogue, 1964:6-7).

5. Faris (1967:55) attempts to vindicate the position of Park and Burgess by asserting that "The Chicago pattern. . . was offered as an example of the general way, apart from local topographical conditions and other special features, by which a modern urban, industrial, expanding city takes its form." Such apologia is not an essential element in prompting one to appreciate the contributions of this period.

However, with the benefit of hindsight and many critical examinations by fellow social scientists, Faris, himself a Chicago product, and Burgess and Bogue (1964) imput a cross-cultural, cross-temporal understanding to the work of this period which, as shall be discussed, was not specified in many of these early writings.

6. As early as 1926, Wirth published an article on Tönnies, which reflected not only his familiarity with Tönnies, but also with Weber. However, the thrust of his interpretation emphasizes the central influence of Simmel so that he characterizes German sociology of the time as the "post- or neo-Simmel movement" (Wirth, 1926:413).

7. Janowitz notes "the relative absence of references to the work of Max Weber" in Park and Burgess' Introduction to the Science of Sociology (Janowitz, 1969:ix). Weber appears to have had little impact on the classicist approach. Although Weber (1864-1920) wrote his major work during the first part of the century, according to Boskoff ". . .(Weber's) influence did not begin to diffuse through European sociology till the thirties and was only integrated into American sociology in the late forties and fifties" (Boskoff, 1972:19). It would be interesting to speculate on the direction of American research might have taken if Weber's work had been more influential. For example, part of Weber's Economy and Society, which has been translated as a separate book under the title, The City (Martindale and Neuwirth, 1958) carefully distinguished between occidental and oriental forms of urbanism. The recognition of such distinctions would have well served the many researchers who later generalized on the basis of culturally limited data.

8. Wirth's early American Journal of Sociology article on Tönnies (Wirth, 1926) cautioned against the domination of a conceptual approach which would limit and pervert viewpoint and method.

> Community and society are suggestive and helpful conceptual tools for the analysis of factual data, but can lead only to sterile philosophizing if they are to be used as the perennial frames into which the many-sided, complex, and elusive facts of reality are to be squeezed" (Wirth, 1926:422).

9. Oscar Lewis, in attempting to explain the discrepancies between his research findings in a re-study of Tepoztlan and those of Refield, asserts "it seems to me that the concept of folk-culture and folk-urban continuum was Redfield's organizing principle in research" (Lewis, 1951:431-432). Redfield denied this, however, asserting that this was "developed afterward" (Redfield, 1955:135).

10. For example, Redfield had to assume that the communities were similar at some previous point in time, and that there was a unilinear "evolutionary" process without "de-evolution" or "side-tracks."

11. These areas are: (1) non-family areas, such as the hobo district, consisting of mainly unmarried or separated males; (2) emancipated

family areas, consisting of rooming houses, hotels and apartment hotels, with individualistic marriages where the "family feels itself freed from the conventions which have been the anathema of feminism" (Mowrer, 1928:111). This is an interstitial area not correlated with any distinct disorganization pattern; (3) paternal family areas where the husband is superordinate, families are large, the residents are proletariate and immigrant peoples and family disorganization is characterized by desertion rather than divorce; (4) equalitarian areas with small families, minimal power differentials, children usually cared for by a nursemaid and family disorganization manifested in both divorce and desertions; and (5) maternal family areas in the commuter suburbs where the wife tends to become family head at the minimum vis a vis neighbors and which have little family disintegration.

12. Mowrer repeatedly emphasizes the importance of the female role in maintaining the marital relationship. In his view, "It is the woman. . . who has been swept farthest from her moorings. In the large realm of life which has suddenly opened to her, there are few, if any, norms of behavior which apply to her (Mowrer, 1927:156).

13. In Groves and Groves 1947 edition of their book, The Family, the important impact of the machine age is again cited. Change has forced itself upon the family (1947:288) and among other things dislodged the patriarchal family system (1947:290).

14. The emphasis on the family as a dependent variable is common in this literature. Zimmerman (1947, 1971, 1972) is one of the few to treat the family as an independent variable.

15. Zimmerman (1971:121) has criticized Ogburn's work for arguing "by indirection" that family love and affection have expanded to replace the many activities taking place outside the home. Zimmerman refers to Ogburn's line of reasoning as an example of "plausible sociology." According to Zimmerman, such plausible sociology "sounds good, seems true, offends no one, and leaves the reader with a very comfortable feeling." However, Zimmerman objects that these qualities are not a substitute for empirical substantiation.

16. An article by Ogburn (1929) in the New York Times Magazine was entitled "The Decline of the American Family." Whether the choice of title was Ogburn's is not known, however such a title might understandably provoke alarmist response in the media.

17. Frazier, some twenty years later, repudiated the assimilationist perspective as one which had "seduced" the American Negro intellectual (see Staples, 1971).

18. Burgess and Cottrell attempt to relate marital happiness to rural versus urban background. Their data on urban dwellers indicated that the highest proportion of respondents with "good adjustment" were reared in the country. However, their findings comparing small town

background versus urban background were inconsistent. Additionally, they suggest that the higher rate of marital happiness that was found for those with rural childhoods may only be characteristic of those who migrate to the city (Burgess and Cottrell, 1939:85-86).

19. Burgess and Locke state that they are using rural and urban as ideal types, likewise the term institutional and companionship. They specify that the ideal type is characterized by four features: (1) it is not meant to be evaluative; (2) it represents the extremes, not the average; (3) it is a logical construct and cannot be found in reality; and (4) the method is not just a procedure for concept formulation, but is a tool for measuring how far the ideal type diverges from reality. Out of the fifteen ideal types which they specify using in their text, ten are polar constructs (Burgess and Locke, 1945:756).

20. Parsons studied at the London School of Economics with Malinowski and received his doctoral degree from Heidelberg University. He rates Durkheim's work as of fundamental influence on his intellectual development (Parsons _et al_., 1961).

21. Zimmerman notes that the domestic family may move back to the trustee form (1947:755):

> The breaking-up of the agencies which support the domestic family externally is generally a cause of this change. The domestic family cannot survive unaided by any external force. When these aides disintegrate, the trustee family re-emerges to fill the break left by decay of the external forces.

22. Leslie (1967:229) notes that Zimmerman's work while provocative is difficult for fellow sociologists to evaluate.

> One of the problems with such an erudite analysis. . . is that lesser mortals cannot be certain that Zimmerman's data are adequate and reliable, and that they have the meaning which Zimmerman attributes to them. While no one questions the integrity of the analysis, there are those who are reluctant to accept it as adequately proven.

The lack of emphasis and training given to historical analysis in the field of sociology suggests that the easiest route to take when faced with such problematic tasks of evaluation is to ignore the issue. This seems to have been largely the fate for Zimmerman's work.

CHAPTER SIX

THE CLASSICIST APPROACH AND ASSUMPTIONS OF THE EUROPEAN THEORISTS

INTRODUCTION

The preceding discussion surveyed the general classicist approach to urban industrial social bonds as evidenced by relevant major works in American sociology. Our focus has been on a period (roughly from the early 1920's to the late 1940's) during which the University of Chicago was a major force in sociology. Of factual necessity the Chicago approach has therefore dominated much of this discussion, just as Chicago sociology dominated the United States during these crucial years of development. Whatever assumptions were common to the Chicago approach to urban industrial interpersonal ties were likely the assumptions transmitted to other generations of students. A critical examination of some of these assumptions is not intended to minimize or derogate the considerable contributions of either the Chicago school or other scholarly contributions which reflected the classicist approach. This approach embodied many major, innovative and stimulating contributions to the field. To examine limitations or potential problems associated with some of its common assumptions is, in one sense, a commentary on the limitations experienced by all scholars by virtue of their humanity and, in another sense, points to the restrictions of time and circumstance which color any intellectual endeavour.

By definition an assumption is the taken for granted; it may or may not be valid. Obviously no work is free from assumptions. To characterize any portion of our intellectual heritage as operating under particular assumptions not only says nothing novel, but is a rather useless truism, unless it can be shown that these assumptions have operated to constrict alternative and possibly profitable approaches to the subject at issue. We previously delineated nine assumptions present in varying degrees in the works of Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the extent to which and the manner in which these assumptions may also have been reflected in the classicist approach.

1. The assumptions that rural interpersonal relationships are superior to urban interpersonal relationships

We earlier noted the pastoralist biases in the work of Tönnies and Simmel. White and White (1962) argue that, among American intellectuals, there has been a tradition of anti-urbanism. Citing work from Robert Park, John Dewey, Thomas Jefferson and others, they uncover a consistent anti-urban theme. White and White (1962:222) summarize this anti-urban theme as one which characterizes the city as

> . . . too big; too noisy, too dusky, too dirty, too smelly, too commercial, too crowded, too full of immigrants, too full of Jews, too full of Irishmen, Italians, Poles, too artificial, destructive of conversation, destructive of communication, too greedy, too capitalistic, too full of automobiles, too full of smog, too full of dust, too heartless, too intellectual, too scientific, insufficiently poetic, too lacking in manners, too mechanical, destructive of family, tribal and patriotic feelings.

In like manner, it may be said that the classicist approach has helped in perpetuating, without adequate empirical support, many of the negative views of city interpersonal life which were summarized by White and White.[1] Although the mental agility and the cultural accruements of urban life may be praised, its social relationships are often assumed to be disadvantageous in contrast to some past point in time. The terminology evoked by the classicist writers Park, Burgess, Sorokin and Zimmerman, Redfield, Wirth and others, is frequently similar to Tönnies and Simmel in its praise of rural social and familial life. Their descriptions of urban social life were frequently contrasted to what they assumed to be the positive characteristics of social life in rural areas. C. Wright Mills, in an article originally published in 1942, examined the literature on social disorganization (much of which emanated from the Chicago school) and noted that

> . . . the basis of 'stability,' 'order,' or 'solidarity,' is not typically analyzed. . . but a conception of such a basis is implicitly used and sanctioned, for some normative conception of a socially 'healthy' and stable organization is involved in the determination of 'pathological' conditions . . . . It may be proposed that the norms in terms of which 'pathological' conditions are detected, are 'humanitarian ideals.' But we must then ask for the social orientation of such ideals. In this literature the operating criteria of the pathological are typically rural in orientation and extraction (Mills, 1971:229-230).

Interestingly, although Mills makes the observation that these studies are colored by a rural bias, he exhibits a form of rural bias of his own in asserting that the problems of urban life are, in part, the result of a deterioration of values which can only exist in rural homogeneous areas (Mills, 1971:230). Mills, too, assumed that the existence of these "rural virtues" was an established fact. This example from

Mills' work illustrates that the romanticization of rural life encompasses not only the more favorable evaluation of rural social life in contrast to urban, but also the attribution to rural life of behaviors which the writer positively values.

The classicist writers frequently alluded to the presumed virtues of the rural family. Many (e.g., Park, Zorbaugh, Reckless, Thrasher, Wirth, Redfield, Mowrer, Frazier and Linton) assumed that this family form was in some or many ways emotionally superior to the urban industrial family. This romanticized vision of the rural family has been referred to by Goode (1963) as the "classical family of Western nostalgia." In Goode's view it conjures up a vision of rural family life involving a large number of noble, upright, moral and happy kinfolk living together on a large economically self-sufficient farm. Even among those writers who emphasize the new intensity of socio-emotional functions in the modern family (e.g., Ogburn, Parsons and Burgess and Locke) there is the assumption that earlier family forms provide a wider and more secure base of socio-emotional support.

The romanticization of the rural family includes an idealization of the form which family life is assumed to take in rural areas, i.e., the conventional family. This perspective limits the likelihood of studying possible rewards in "deviant" family forms (e.g., single parent families, the unmarried, the childless), as well as lessening the chances of exploring functional equivalents to the family (e.g., Zorbaugh, 1928, viewed the alliances of bohemians and the deep friendships of Persian and Turkish males as symptomatic of family disorganization and by implication deviant. Similarly the non-legalized heterosexual pairings of Anderson's (1923) transient men were dismissed as emotionally shallow).

The romanticization of past forms and seemingly simpler times finds its way into many writings. Eric Wolf (1964) cites examples in anthropology of the overevaluation of the primitive. Lovejoy and Boas (1935:7) have characterized such thoughtways as "cultural primitivism" by which they mean "the discontent of the civilized with civilization, or with some conspicuous and characteristic feature of it." The pastoralist assumption common in the classicist approach finds strong kinship in the work of Simmel and Tönnies. Given Simmel's widely recognized influence on urban research and the apparently not uncommon receptivity to "cultural primitivism" this should not be surprising.

2. The assumed superiority of emotional in contrast to rational interpersonal relationships

Simmel and Tönnies both assumed the superiority of a spontaneous, emotional relationship over one which is rational or calculated. This same assumption is found in several of the classicist writings. Park assumed that rural life was emotional and evaluated this quality positively. In rural areas, according to Park (1969:111), interactions are "immediate and unreflecting" and are characterized by "instinct" and "feeling." Social control is "spontaneous" rather than the result of a "rational and abstract" consideration.

The position of Louis Wirth was similar. In an early paper Wirth (1925:219) wrote, "There is a city mentality which is clearly differentiated from the rural mind. The city man thinks in mechanistic terms, in rational terms, while the rustic thinks in naturalistic, magical terms." In his later paper, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," Wirth (1969:153) described urban interactions as being based upon expediency. In such situations, the individual may have some degree of freedom from control; however, "he loses. . . the spontaneous self-expression, the morale and the sense of participation that comes from living in an integrated society." Similarly, Redfield (1947:293) characterized and gave positive valence to behavior in the folk society which he saw as ". . .traditional, spontaneous, uncritical and personal. . . (here). . . there is no legislation or habit of experiment and reflection for intellectual ends."

Likewise, Sorokin and Zimmerman characterized urban social contacts as calculating and frequently formed as a means to an end. In contrast, in rural areas there is more emotionalism and, due to this, social interaction moves beyond the shell of man and comes closer to his "heart, soul, or personality" (Sorokin and Zimmerman, 1929:56).

This assumed superiority of an emotional relationship over a rational/calculated relation is similar to the assumptions of Simmel and Tönnies. It is a leitmotif which has yet to receive empirical verification.

3. The assumed superiority of role generalized as opposed to role specific relationships

Of the three European theorists discussed, only Tönnies assumed the superiority of role generalized over role specific relationships. Simmel rejected the assumption that one such form of relationship is necessarily superior to the other. This assumption, however, is reflected in some of the writing on the classicist approach. Sorokin and Zimmerman (1929) characterized urban contacts as superficial. People play distinct roles such as doctor, patient or customer, and thereby remain only "human abstractions." In contrast, highly evaluated rural relationships are seen as pervasive interactions which go beyond the "social dress" of the individual (Sorokin and Zimmerman, 1929:56). Wirth (1969) echoed Park's (1969) earlier observation that city social contacts are segmented and superficial. In urban areas, while the number of people met may be large, the number known in some total sense is small. Likewise, Redfield (1941:17) saw the folk society as characterized by role encompassing relationships and, therefore, there is "a high degree of mutual understanding of much of the habitual mental life of one another." The social relationships of the folk society have a "predominantly personal character" (Redfield, 1941:343).

Whatever the terminology used, be it segmented, non-pervasive or non-personal, there is a tendency among these writers to assume that a role generalized relationship is more rewarding than a role specific one. This is still another social-psychological assumption not subjected, in this literature, to empirical test.

4. The assumption of the superiority of enduring relationships in contrast to transitory relationships

Throughout the classicist writings there is a running assumption that transitory relationships are less satisfying than enduring relationships. While this may be an accurate assessment, it is assumed without empirical test. In The Hobo, Anderson saw the city as providing kindred souls for the homeless men of his study; here there were people who would "understand" regardless of how miserable a man's lot might be in life. However, Anderson (1923:4) defined it as "pathetic" that these relationships were transitory. Likewise, Anderson did not explore the possible rewards of intense homosexual pairings which were generally short-lived. Zorbaugh (1929), in The Gold Coast and the Slum, decried the short-lived promiscuous contacts of people in Chicago's bohemian area. Faris and Dunham (1960:158-159), in Mental Disorders in Urban Areas, described the slum area as chaotic because there "continuity of . . . life-experiences is most rare." Similarly, Zorbaugh (1929) saw the lack of continuity in tradition and occupation contributing to the disintegration of the immigrant family. Thrasher (1927) saw lack of permanence in gangs as disadvantageous to their members. Wirth's (1969:153) article on the city appeared to equate transitory relationships with impersonal and segmental relationships. The rapid turnover of membership in urban areas was seen as disadvantageous. "Overwhelmingly the city dweller is not a homeowner, and since a transitory habitat does not generate binding traditions and sentiments, only rarely is he a true neighbor" (Wirth, 1969:157). Park's (1915) article on the city depicted mobility (such as that of the transient peddler) as precluding intimate attachment to people. The transitory and less stable contacts which Park saw as characterizing urban areas meant that while people meet they do not "know" one another. Sorokin and Zimmerman saw urban interaction as impermanent and short-lived "in contrast to permanent, strong, and durable relations" in rural life (Sorokin and Zimmerman, 1929:53)(emphasis added).

Although the validity of the assumption that enduring social relationships are, in some manner, superior to those which are transitory has not been tested, this quality is frequently used to characterize the negative aspects of urban interpersonal life. This same assumption was reflected in the work of all three European theorists.

5. The assumed validity of generalizations derived from unrepresentative categories

The classical approach frequently presumed to make valid generalizations about urban interaction and urban social characteristics with little consideration given to variations between age, stage in life cycle, class, educational or gender categories. Following Simmel's lead, neither Park nor Wirth nor Zimmerman and Sorokin adequately distinguished between these categories when characterizing the "nature" of urban social ties. The sophistication and rationality which they imputed to the urban personality should, at the least, have raised questions regarding social class differences.

The practice of Simmel, Durkheim and, to some extent, Tönnies of assuming that generalizations based upon single gender behavior (i.e., male) were sufficient and necessary to explain human behavior were echoed in much of the work of the classicist tradition. Little attention was given to the position or role of women in the structure of urban social interaction. The functions and behavior associated with the male role were usually by default, the ones represented as significant urban behaviors. Thrasher's (1927) examination of urban gangs, for example, did not explore the implications of the relative absence of female gangs in the city. Zorbaugh's (1928) study cited the well-socialized girls in the "disorganized" Italian slum families. One might infer from this that the determining factor regarding the degree of organization of a family is how it socializes its males, for Zorbaugh does not bother to examine these sex differentials. Some writers (e.g., Mowrer and Ogburn and Groves) singled out the emancipation of women as a factor contributing to family problems (particularly as it is embodied in a challenge to patriarchal authority). However, the decreased functions of the family unit and its responsiveness to kin were not examined by sex. Ogburn, for example, did not carefully differentiate between class, ethnic or sex differences in response to technological advances and their possibly differential relation to "family functions." As was mentioned earlier, Parson's handling of class differences with regard to the isolation of the nuclear family was neither sensitive nor sophisticated. It appeared to be based on data from the white, middle-class, yet at times the intended generalizability of his work seemed much broader. Despite the large numbers of people in North America who are not in traditional, intact nuclear units (i.e., the single, divorced and widowed), differences in marital status and family attachment were not explored. Hence large numbers of people were virtually labeled by some writers as irrelevant to the examination of the "extendedness" of the urban industrial family. Additionally, the classicist approach to the family assumed that the male occupational role determines family status; and the degree of involvement with extended kin is circumscribed by that role.[2] Sex differentials in the isolation of the members of the nuclear unit were not considered. Thus the role of women in the larger kin network was overlooked.

Burgess and Locke (1945:144) suggested that there were differentials in urbanism across family units when controlling for zonal areas, social class, religion and ethnicity. However, this was not expanded and they were uncertain about the propriety of discussing homeless single men as family types. Further, they saw any "rural" family traits in urban areas as only transitory. The general pattern in the classicist approach was only minimally sensitive to the differential impact of age, gender, class or life cycle influences. These influences were not considered in generalizations about urban industrial social bonds.

6. The assumption that urbanism and industrialism are static phenomena

It will be recalled that of the three European theorists only Durkheim showed sensitivity to cultural variations in forms of urbanity. Although Tönnies had suggested that differing combinations of Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft qualities could co-exist in urban areas, he saw the Gemeinschaft as not characteristic of urbanity per se, but rather as a carry-over or remnant of pre-urban life. Similarly, none of the three theorists adequately differentiated between forms of industrialization.

The classicist approach, as manifested in both family and urban studies, tended to treat urbanism and industrialism as static phenomena. Wirth (1938) has acknowledged the variability of cities and the impact of different technological bases, but the fact remains that he did not incorporate this into his theoretical scheme. Once his definition of the city was proposed, Wirth seemed to see the consequences presumed to flow from it as trans-cultural and trans-historical. The particular problem for Wirth, as for Redfield and Burgess and Locke, is that he professed to be working with ideal types, however the hypothetical nature of these types was not infrequently overlooked (see Appendix A).

Urbanization was often used as a catch-all category and an all-around explanatory concept (e.g., Mowrer, 1927; Wirth, 1938; Burgess and Cottrell, 1939).[3] Industrialization was often treated as a major independent variable, but its variations and sub-types were not examined (e.g., Mowrer, 1927; Groves and Ogburn, 1928; Linton, 1949; Parsons and Bales, 1955).[4] Upon occasion urbanization and industrialization were used interchangeably (e.g., Mowrer, 1927) with little acknowledgment of the fact that they need not necessarily co-exist.

7. The assumption of a unidirectional path to modernity

Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel were similar in their implicit assumption that divergent forms of humankind would react similarly to the forces of modernization. The classicist approach tended to reflect the same assumption. This assumption, however, was presented in somewhat specialized terminology, the terminology of assimilation.

The prevailing ideology of American society and American sociology from the 1920's through the 1950's favored an assimilationist view. America had been flooded with immigrants from many diverse lands. The idea of America as a "melting-pot" had been introduced in a play by Zangwill in 1920 and found great popular appeal. Wirth's (1969:150) major article, "Urbanism as a Way of Life" broadly characterized "the" city as a melting-pot of race, peoples and culture." For many people assimilation came to be "viewed as the embodiment of the democratic ethos" (Metzger, 1971). America was portrayed as the land of equal opportunity - under certain conditions. New immigrants could be assured a full place in the life of America - including their right to socioeconomic advancement as they assimilated into the dominant stream of American values. Horton (1966:707-708) has noted that under such conditions "equality is won by conformity. . . . Equality means equal opportunity to achieve the same American values; in other words, equality is gained by losing one identity and conforming at some level to another demand by a dominant group."

Robert Park's well-known race relations cycle predicted the end result of inter-ethnic contact as assimilation.

> The impression that emerges from this review of international and race relations is that the forces which have brought about the existing interpenetration of peoples are so vast and irresistible that the resulting changes assume the character of a cosmic process. . . . The race relations cycle which takes the form, to state it abstractly, of contacts, competition, accommodation and eventual assimilation, is apparently progressive and irreversible. Customs regulations, immigration restrictions and racial barriers may slacken the tempo of the movement; may perhaps halt it altogether for a time; but cannot change its direction; cannot at any rate, reverse it (Park, 1964:149 passim).

E.Franklin Frazier had similar views regarding assimilation. His books on the black family viewed its eventual success in terms of the assimilation of dominant values and culture. Frazier held and published these views from the early thirties until just prior to his death in 1962.[5] It was, in fact, a position little challenged during the dominant period of the classicist approach.

An assimilationist view carries with it potential perceptual blinders. Metzger (1971:635), for example, has characterized this position as leading to viewing "ethnicity as a survival of primary, quasi-tribal loyalties, which can have only a dysfunctional place in the achievement-oriented, rationalized and impersonal social relationships of the modern industrial-bureaucratic order."

The dominant approach in American sociology during this period assumed both the inevitability and desirability of assimilation. This may serve to partially explain why many of the Chicago monographs did not fully explore the supportive socio-emotional ties existing in urban ethnic enclaves. Although they were sometimes recognized (e.g., Wirth, 1928), they were not generally incorporated into the view of urbanism, industrialism or modernity.[6] Certainly there was little consideration given to the possibility that new Americans might reject the dominant ideology or that multi-culturalism or functional pluralism might be another possibility to consider in the modern urban industrial setting.

For example, W.I. Thomas (1971:121), in a book edited by Park, singled out the Italians as a group characterized by "having the strongest wish to remain in solitary communities." However, Thomas (1971:124) sees the fulfillment of that wish as hopeless. Similarly, while institutions might act to maintain cultural distinction, these find great difficulty surviving in the new environment. While the synagogue may be viewed by immigrant Jews as a unifying force, in Thomas' (1971:127) view, the "synagogue Jew. . . is passing away" and "the synagogue owes its existence more to the momentum of the past than to any new forces created in this country that make for its conservation and development."

The assimilationist view is reflected by Talcott Parsons in a defense of his thesis regarding the isolated nuclear family. Parsons writes

> It is of course a common place that the American family is predominantly and, in a sense, increasingly, an urban middle-class family. There has indeed been, if not a very great equalization of income (though there has been some in the present century), a very substantial homogeneization of

> patterns of life in the population with reference to a number of things. Basic to this are the employment of one or more family members outside the home; the nuclear family household without domestic service except for cleaning and babysitting; and the basic constituents of the standard of living, including in particular the familiar catalogue of consumer durable goods, which constitute the basic capital equipment of the household. . .it can be seen that, in a sense that has probably never existed before, in a society that, in most respects, has undergone a process of very extensive structural differentiation, there has emerged a remarkably uniform, basic type of family (Parsons, 1970:195-196)(emphasis added).

The focus on family values in the classicist studies tended to be heavily white and middle class. To be sure, Mowrer and Burgess and Locke described variations in family patterns in different areas of the city, but these tended to become lost once they moved into discussions and broader attempts to analyze "the" urban industrial family. The dominance of the assimilationist perspective would likely predispose the observer to assume that any ethnic manifestations of solidarity in the press of urban industrial life, were but short-lived carry-overs from village life which were neither characteristic of urbanity *per se* nor destined to persist in the face of the assimilationist goal. Little attention was thus given to the possibility that the prior history of a group of people might have impact on their present, and that their future might be quite different from other urbanized populations. The possibility of a cultural or sub-cultural group attempting to influence the direction of its change was not considered. Hence manifestations of ethnic kin and extra-kin solidarity tended to be downplayed and there was a failure to incorporate these into the broader perspective of urban industrial social bonds.

8. The assumed sufficiency of an ahistorical analysis

It was earlier noted that the three European theorists, Durkheim, Simmel and Tönnies, avoided historical scholarship. Occasional sporadic references to secondary sources were used to support a point when convenient but there were no analyses using primary historical data, or even a rigorous use of secondary materials. The classicist approach followed a similar pattern.

Edward Shils (1948:53), in an early survey of American sociology, criticized its representatives for being deficient in wide historical knowledge and having little training in logic, metaphysics or intellectual history. This criticism holds for much of the classical approach.

Few writers evidenced any appreciation of the historical dimension in their attempts to generalize about the nature of modern interpersonal ties. Wirth's (1969) article on urban anonymity revealed his acquaintance with the problems of historical documentation and the fallacy of treating all cities as unitary phenomena. The fact remains that once Wirth professed awareness of this fallacy, he did little to incorporate this knowledge into the body of his discussion and his attempt to develop a theory of urban life. Despite his professed awareness of possible historical differences, Wirth, like many other classicist writers and most other American sociologists of his period, did not take historical data into account. Occasional examples were sometimes quoted by these writers, but it was generally a patchwork job scarcely resembling a methodical historical examination. The temporal dimension was often invoked (i.e., "things" have changed) but rarely analyzed. At the most cross-sectional analyses were used to explicate change (e.g., Redfield, 1941). To the extent that any of these writings attempted to impute change from rural-urban observations, they were basing diachronic conclusions upon synchronic observations. The issue is a historical one which was being answered in a non-historical manner.

Between the 1920's and 1950, Zimmerman's (1948) historical study of the family stood out as a notable exception. However, Zimmerman did not attract either converts or imitators. His historical work has remained as a very unique (and not widely appreciated) contribution of the period. As with the European theorists, the supporters of the classicist approach were apparently satisfied with the sufficiency of, at the most, cross-sectional analyses and, at the least, with intuitive hunches. This general disregard for historical data reflected, among other things, a neglect of possibly fruitful unobtrusive measures.

9. The assumed adequacy of culture-bound data for generalizations about humankind

For varying reasons, probably both practical and ideological, the work of Durkheim, and particularly Simmel and Tönnies, suffered from a lack of cross-cultural comparison. The classicist approach could be similarly characterized. The supportive data were often narrowly specific although the generalizations derived from these data were apparently intended to be broad. We say apparently because a consistent problem in evaluating many of these writings is the extent to which a) the writers were rather naively unaware of the importance of cross-cultural comparison, or b) the writers were aware of this but they limited their focus to the specific culture or even city under study. In either case, their conclusions were read by others as "universal" generalizations.

Even Robert Redfield, whose work took him out of the United States, showed a consistent cultural bias. Lewis noted (1965:494)

> The thinking of Simmel, Tönnies, Durkheim and others, which influenced Redfield, was. . . based on experience with the endogamous peasant communities of Europe. Had these men done field work with the Nuer of Africa, with the Australian aborigines, or with the North Indian peasant, it is quite possible that Redfield's ideal-type model of the folk society might have been somewhat different.

The classicist writers often talked about "the" family and "the" city with little qualification. Zorbaugh's work stands as a case in point. He sometimes refers specifically to Chicago, at other times to the industrial city (Zorbaugh, 1929:221), then again to "the modern city, industrial or commercial" (1929:232n) and at another point to the "modern city" which does not have "communities of the type of the peasant villages of Europe, or the early American Town" (Zorbaugh, 1929:227). Many of the other writers also seem to shift reference points (e.g., Thrasher, 1927; Reckless, 1933; Wirth, 1938). Similarly, writings on the American family shift to discussions of "the" industrial or "the" urban family (e.g., Mowrer, 1927; Parsons, 1943; 1949; 1955; and Linton, 1949).

Komarovsky (1955:232), in referring to family textbooks prior to 1950, noted their

> Authors often discharge their obligation to the concept of cultural relativity by an introductory chapter on 'Other Family Patterns' and a general statement that the rest of book deals with our own family system. This general disclaimer of universality does not prevent students from accepting the generalizations cited throughout the text as universal and it certainly does not help them to see socio-psychological processes in relation to the larger social structure in which they occur.

One cannot read intentions. One can only evaluate the written evidence. For the most part, the writers of the classicist persuasion were neither specific enough in their reference point nor consistent enough. This readily leads to confusion and possible misinterpretation. This was a period in American sociology when little cross-cultural research was being funded and, in fact, there was much that was unresearched within the United States itself. It was, however, the lack of cross-cultural evidence and even adequate intra-cultural comparison which led to the challenges of the classicist approach. The point remains that regardless of the intent of the authors, their work was not comparative enough; yet the restrictions on its generalizability were rarely emphasized.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The preceding nine assumptions, present in varying degrees in the work of the European theorists, made their way into the literature representing the classicist approach. The socio-emotional life of rural areas was consistently more highly evaluated than that of urban areas. The superiority of emotional, role generalized and enduring relationships in contrast to their opposites was often assumed without test. An assimilationist perspective facilitated the view of a unidirectional path to modernity. Indeed there was a broader tendency to overlook the theoretical relevance of gender, class or of age differences. Much was attributed to urbanization and industrialization but these concepts were generally not analytically examined. The classicist writers did not generally make use of cross-cultural data, yet at the same time they were often vague and inconsistent about their intended range of generalization.

We now turn to Chapter Seven which examines different empirical challenges to the classicist approach.

CHAPTER SIX

FOOTNOTES

1. Oscar Lewis, for example, characterizes Wirth's description of the city as reading in some respects "like another version of the fall of man" (Lewis, 1970:126).

2. For the first major challenges to this assumption see Watson and Barth, 1964; Barth and Watson, 1965, 1967. Barth and Watson's work questions, among other things, whether the nuclear family can justifiably be taken as a unit of equivalent evaluation. In an examination of 1960 United States census data, they found that about one third of the labor force was female, about one fifth of the households in the United States were headed by the wife or consisted of an unmarried female and about forty per cent of the female labor force was unmarried.

3. Dewey's (1960) search through Wirth's article illustrates some of the problems in carefully specifying relevant, manageable, variables. Wirth's picture of the urban personality resulting from the amalgamation of the three variables defining urbanism, results in some twenty features as compiled by Dewey

> . . . . reserve, blase outlook, indifference; sophistication and cosmopolitanism; rationality; relativistic perspectives; tolerant, competitive, self-aggrandizing, and exploitative attitudes; feelings of friction, irritation, and nervous tension bred by frustration; acceptance of instability and insecurity; tolerance of eccentricity and novelity and approval of efficiency and inventions; and marked degrees of personal disorganization (Dewey, 1960:61).

Similarly, the same three variables of large size, density, and heterogeneity are seen by Wirth as related to a lengthy list of social conditions:

> . . . greater importance of secondary, rather than primary, contacts; greater interdependence of specialists; less dependence upon particular individuals; impersonal transitory, superficial, segmental, and utilitarian social contacts; less integrated social organization; pecuniary nexus; exaggerated importance of time; predatoriness; formal controls; anonymity; flexible caste structure but sharpened and ramified differentiation by income and social status; heightened mobility, involuntary segregation of racial, linguistic, income, and class groups; more tenancy, rapid turnover of membership of groups and wide divergence of it; membership in groups tangential to each other; greater importance of symbols and stereo-

> types; standardization of products and processes; gearing of facilities and institutions to the average user; subordination of individuality; weakened bonds of kinship, decline of the social significance of the family; loss of traditional bases of solidarity; disappearance of neighborhood; high rate of gainful employment of adults; and replacement of territorially based social units with interest groups (Dewey, 1960:61-62).

4. Redfield took the position that "there is not much division of labor in the folk society; what one person does is what another does. In the ideal folk society, all the tools and ways of production are shared by everybody" (Redfield, 1947). Redfield makes an exception to his reference to "everybody" by noting that sex differences are the exception to the homogeneity of the folk society. Redfield, as had Durkheim, equated the division of labor with industrialism, thereby ignoring communities which might have division of labor without industrialization (e.g., India under the cast system).

5. Shortly before his death in 1952, Frazier questioned the assimilationist perspective noting that:

> The African intellectual recognizes what colonialism has done to the African and he sets as his first task the mental, moral and spiritual rehabilitation of the African.
>
> But the American Negro intellectual, seduced by dreams of assimilation, has never regarded this as his primary task. . . .
>
> It is the responsibility of the Negro intellectual to provide a positive identification through history, literature, art, music and the drama.
>
> The truth of the matter is that for most Negro intellectuals the integration of the Negro means just the opposite, the emptying of his life of meaningful context and ridding him of all Negro identification. For them, integration and eventual assimilation mean the annihilation of the Negro-physically, culturally and spiritually (E. Franklin Frazier, "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual," Negro Digest 30 (Summer), 214-222, quoted in Staples, 1971).

6. Wirth's personal life also apparently belied his writings. Everett Hughes has observed that with Wirth's rise to prominence, "I always have thought that he did not go on in Park's imaginative way, but rather became a bit too much a disciple on the theory side. Louis used to say all those things about how the city is impersonal - while living with a whole clan of kin and friends on a very personal basis" (Hughes in personal correspondence with Short, 1971:xxxix n).

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE RELATIVIST APPROACH: A COMPARATIVE AND EMPIRICAL CHALLENGE

INTRODUCTION

The classical approach to urban industrial social bonds had, in varying degrees, argued that there was a major attenuation of both kin and extra kin support ties in modern society. This argument was rather well supported for many years by a climate in American sociology which, perhaps for somewhat ethnocentric as well as practical reasons, emphasized monocultural research. Sociology was a new field, established neither professionally nor financially. Funding operations were minimal and as such could not provide the monetary base to encourage cross-cultural research. It should not be surprising, therefore, that there was an intra-United States focus in the field. In family studies the kin isolation of the marital unit was generally accepted and reiterated in family textbooks. In fact, textbooks on marriage stressed that detachment from parents was a sign of maturity while close ties were "neurotic" (Komarovsky, 1955).[1] The attention of family researchers was directed toward different problems — issues such as dating, courtship and marriage (an emphasis attributed by one writer to both the practical interests of the researchers and the applied demands of college students, see Irish, 1966:156). It was not until the early 1950's, that cross-cultural research was increasingly in evidence. At this point both cross-cultural and intra-cultural studies began to appear which seemed to challenge the classicist belief in modern kinship isolation and urban anonymity and loneliness. For want of an agreed-upon label for this genre of studies, we shall refer to it as the "relativist approach."

CROSS-CULTURAL CHALLENGES

Basic to the classicist argument is the contrast between rural and urban social life and between pre-industrial and industrial social life. An idyllic picture was often painted of warm, expansive family and friendship ties in simpler societies. Cross-cultural research, however, began to suggest that this idyllic picture might be far from universally valid.

Redfield's work, which attempted to move out of the western sphere of research, was subjected to much criticism. Earliest criticisms focused on his descriptions of pre-urban social life. Research on peasant communities began to raise serious questions about the validity of these assumptions regarding pre-urban life. As early as 1939, Redfield's work had been subjected to critical examination through the work of Sol Tax (1939:1941) in Guatemala. Tax cited Guatemalan Indians as an example which qualified Redfield's assumptions that pre-modern social ties were personalized, intimate and supportive. According to Tax, impersonal social relations characterize both intra- and inter-community associations of Guatemalan Indians. A commercial spirit is found not only in the economic sphere but also in the religious, political, and familial. Contrary to classical assumptions regarding pre-urban life, Tax found that his subjects exhibited a "primitive" world view but so-called "civilized" social relations.

> To know these Indians outwardly — without knowing their minds so to speak — is to know a people who, albeit on a small scale, partake of the impersonal, secular, individually-free social and economic life that is the pattern of our big city (Tax, 1941:39).

Although Tax's observations acted to minimally qualify some of Redfield's assertions,[2] it is quite evident that Tax was also working on the assumption that there was verified evidence regarding the nature of urban life. He characterized the relationships of the Guatemalan Indians as "not unlike (the social relations) of a great city in which a most general characteristic is the anonymity of the inhabitants" (Tax, 1941:34). Hence his cautionary observations (which were not disseminated throughout the sociological literature) focused on the folk end of the continuum.

Data from ethnographies has continued to accumulate over the years which acts to qualify classical assumptions regarding pre-urban life. An early study which sharply criticized Redfield's research was Oscar Lewis' restudy of Redfield's village of Tepoztlan (Lewis, 1951). Initially, Lewis had intended to do a personality study in Tepoztlan using Redfield's work as a base; however, when he noted differences between Redfield's descriptions of Tepoztlan and his own, he decided instead upon a re-study, some seventeen years after Redfield's 1926 field research.

Lewis' observations regarding the interpersonal life of the Tepoztlan villagers make a startling contrast to Redfield's findings. In clear contrast to the view taken by Redfield, and in sharp contrast to the classic assumptions regarding rural warmth, emotionalism and openness expressed by so many of the writers reviewed, Lewis found the

Tepoztlan villager to be non-demonstrative, fearful, jealous and mistrustful toward both family and friends. He did not appear to understand altruism on the part of others. Though the folk-urban distinction regarding primary and secondary relationships assumes face-to-face contact is necessarily intimate, Lewis noted the following:

> Although living side by side, Tepoztecans communicate little of their innermost thoughts, aspirations, fears, likes and dislikes and, for the most part, remain strangers to one another. While a man may know a great deal about most of his neighbors in a small barrio, and about some in other barrios, and may know them as so-called whole persons, that is, in their various roles as parents, neighbors, godparents, mayordomos, or farmers, what is known are the relatively superficial aspects of personality only. Tepoztecans are a practical people concerned with external behavior, and they judge others by actions rather than by attitudes, ideas, or inner life (Lewis, 1951:289).

Friendship involving interpersonal aid, trust and warmth is avoided by the Tepoztlan villagers. A large degree of hostility is present in interpersonal relationships but this is shown indirectly through sorcery, malicious gossip, covert destruction of property and manifestations of envy and ridicule.

Lewis' description is many times removed from the picture of rural social tranquility drawn in Redfield's earlier study of Tepoztlan. Such findings regarding rural life defy the idyllic view presented by the classicist approach, European writers such as Tönnies and Simmel, and the more ancient tradition of appreciation for pre-urban social life (see Sorokin, Zimmerman and Galpin, 1965).

Banfield's (1958) study of the family in a southern Italian village is another somewhat jarring assault on classic assumptions regarding rural family tranquility and interpersonal warmth and support. Banfield's research, conducted in 1954-55 in Montegrano, found a divided community whose residents were seemingly unable to act in concert for the common good. There was, according to Banfield, no element of public spiritedness and people in the village and the church resisted charitable or social welfare activities. This Banfield attributed to a condition which he termed "amoral familialism" or "amoral individualism." According to Banfield (1958:83), the amoral familist will "maximize the material, short-run advantage of the nuclear family; assume that all others will do likewise." Banfield attributes "amoral familialism" to three factors acting in combination: a high death rate; conditions of land tenure which involve dividing the land into tiny parcels; and the lack of institutionalization of the extended family.

People are distrustful and suspicious of relatives outside the nuclear unit. When a new family unit is established through marriage in this community, bonds with the old family are weakened, ". . . when a man marries, he often ceases to be on good terms with a parent, brothers or sisters, or with his whole paternal family" (Banfield, 1958:112-113). Due to the high death rate, many children are left orphaned. However, they cannot expect to be automatically taken in by other family members. If taken in, the child may have to act as a servant, ". . . at best, he cannot expect to be treated as an equal by them" (Banfield, 1958:142). Banfield cites cases which suggest the frequency in which children have nightmares about being abandoned by their families. Rural family life in Montegrano, as described by Banfield, is far from the "classic family of western nostalgia."

Other studies provided additional examples of rural settings characterized by interpersonal suspicion, mistrust, fear, lack of cooperation, critical, gossip oriented behavior and a general view of one's social world as a threatening place. Hamed Ammar in Egypt (1954) and George Foster's work in Tzintzuntzan, Mexico (1967) belie the glories of the rural life. Foster (1967:94-95) describes Tzintzuntzan social life in the following manner:

> . . . there is much loneliness in the character of people. Simple friendship and warm feelings without ulterior motives often come with difficulty, and though many people have good friends, most have very few intimate friends. Even within close families there is reserve. . . .

Foster attempts to explain such findings through the concept of "the limited good." Those holding this view see almost all of the desirable things in life, be they land, health, love, honor, influence, or friendship, as existing "in absolute quantities insufficient to fill even minimal needs of villagers" (Foster, 1967:123). In addition, people believing in the limited good see no feasible way to increase the limited supply. Hence, life becomes a zero-sum game. One family or individual can advance only at the expense of another. Love or friendship shown toward one person means a decreasing amount for someone else. One man's luck means all other's misfortune.

The urban cross-cultural perspective was almost entirely neglected by the classical approach. A very early work by Miner (1953) attempted to bridge this gap. Miner's intention was to find a city relatively free (although it was not completely so) of western influence and of industrialization. His subject area was the city of Timbuctoo in French West Africa. Although the decision may well be argued, Miner characterized Timbuctoo, with a population of around 6,000, as a city. Following this, Miner's examination of the "city" revealed three distinct ethnic groups and, in contrast to Chicago, little evidence of social disorganization. On the contrary, there were strong ethnic and family ties. Miner's work might have provided some qualifications for the classical approach. However the comparison between a "city" of 6,000 (Timbuctoo) and one of something like 3½ million (for example, Chicago in 1935) presented some obvious problems.

Oscar Lewis, (1952) in a study of immigrant peasants in Mexico City, found that lower-class residents of the city had less anonymity and less difficulty in adjusting to urban life than would have been anticipated from classic urban theory. Catholic religious life became more disciplined. The family life of these migrants was stable and extended kin ties increased rather than decreased.

Another early article by Kolb (1954) suggested that it was erroneous to assume that the American pattern (i.e., the pattern of Chicago) would of necessity be relevant cross-culturally for cities in "backward areas" of the world. Kolb suggested that the tradition of American urban sociology as represented by the Chicago school was historically relative – perhaps appropriate to the city of Chicago during the 1920's but of doubtful value not only cross-culturally but also for current cities in the United States.

Similarly McKimm Marriott (1954), agreeing with some of the points raised by Kolb regarding the inappropriateness of American urban research for understanding urbanism in developing areas, cited India as a case in point. Although not providing empirical data, Marriott suggested that Indian cities have heterogeneous ethnic groups without Chicago style urbanization. There is numerical density without "universalistic achievement" values; and, even though possessing dense, numerically large, heterogeneous populations, Indian urbanites also possess strong primary ties.

Empirical research by Sylvia Vatuk (1972) in Meerut, a moderately industrialized city of 284,000 people in northern India, supports Marriott's earlier thesis. Vatuk found that migrants to the city usually had previous ties of village or kinship which facilitated their adaptation to city life. Migrants move into "mohallas" (named and emotionally bounded districts of the city) and ". . .do not normally find themselves isolated from social intercourse with their neighbors, but, if they are receptive to what the mohalla offers, soon become caught up in a web of social obligations for visiting and gift exchange" (Vatuk, 1972:198).

Research by Bruner (1966) in Medan, Indonesia, a city of 360,000, found that the range of kinship contacts is wider in the city than in the village and embraces a larger number of more distantly related individuals. Additionally, urban clan associations have emerged, which assist in migrant adjustment. Bruner suggests that this may be a stage in the urbanization process.

Similarly, Epstein (1967) notes that migrants to African cities have an increase in feelings of tribal identity for they become conscious of their differences. In urbanized, basically non-industrialized, African Ndola, a city whose 50,000 inhabitants are ethnically mixed and highly mobile, Epstein (1969a) notes that there are strong kinship and tribal ties. Social disorganization is not in evidence.

Likewise, Bascom's (1970) study of Yoruban cities in Nigeria illustrates the importance of lineage. Strong kin controls exist. According to Bascom (1970:118) in these areas, "the city is a secondary group, while the lineage is primary." Petersen's (1971) research in Cairo tentatively lends support to earlier hypotheses by Abu-Lughod (1961) that recent migrants to the city find the workings of village support systems.

Joan Aldous (1968), in a summary of African studies, finds that the cities of Brazzaville, Dakar, Lagos, Leopoldville and Stanleyville retain extended family ties:

> Besides filling recreational, religious, legal or economic needs of urbanites, it substitutes for a nonexistent public social welfare program. Kinsmen provide for the elderly and support the sick, the jobless and the destitute. . . . A corollary of this is that the individual urbanite, far from facing the complex urban milieu as a solitary individual, exists in a web of friendship relations in the extended family (Aldous, 1968:305).

Urbanized, industrialized Japan stands as still another challenge to the classic position. Japanese urban areas do not reflect the isolation and anonymity which would be expected by the writings of the classic tradition (Dore, 1958; Vogel, 1967; Abeggler, 1968). Strong supportive ties are provided urban workers through their long-term association with a business firm. Feelings of loyalty, solidarity, dependence and belongingness are encompassed in this association. Urbanization has been accompanied by a decrease in rates of divorce and did not involve a break with the kinship structure. A version of the extended family, the stem family, has existed for 400 years and continues to exist (Johnson, 1960). The evidence regarding the family is not without its purported changes. Dore (1958), studying 100 families in a Tokyo ward, found an increasing emphasis on the nuclear unit.

However, Vogel (1967) points out that the pattern has been for the stem family system to encourage the migration of sons other than (usually) the eldest. This isolation has encouraged greater dependence between the marital pair, however family sponsorship, although becoming tempered with elements of achievement, still maintains an important ascriptive influence.

Vogel (1971:280-281), in a study of middle-class families, makes the following claims regarding his urban subjects:

> Family life is much the same as it was a decade ago; even the close relationship with grandparents and the frequency of young married couples visiting their parents has not greatly declined. . . . It is not uncommon for a young unmarried couple to live with or near their parents.

The above studies of social ties in non-western areas have posed a significant challenge to the classical position. In addition, there are further varieties of empirical research challenges.

INTRA-CULTURAL CHALLENGES

A systematic flow of research began to appear in the early fifties which challenged the validity of the classicist argument as it referred to urban industrial life in the United States. Various forms of interpersonal contact were reported and used as examples to either refute or qualify the classicist argument.

A series of articles by Marvin B. Sussman (1953, 1954, 1959, 1962) challenged belief in the "isolation" of the nuclear family. His initial article is often cited as a forerunner among the large number of empirical works which challenged the classic approach to the family. Sussman (1953) found, in his study of white, middle-class Americans, that parents tactfully gave financial aid to their children in 154 out of 195 cases in his sample. Help was both financial and service oriented (e.g., babysitting) although financial aid was rarely on a regularized basis. There was a reciprocity involved with parents expecting in return love and affection from their adult children. In later years, after the child's own children were launched, he, in turn, might reciprocate by giving assistance to his now elderly parents (Sussman and Burchinal, 1962).

A host of studies began to appear which cited the existence of apparently important family and/or friendship ties which seemed to have been overlooked by the classical approach. For example, research by Smith _et_ _al_. (1954), in a central city with a population of approximately 100,000 and a metropolitan area of 140,000, found that a large majority of the respondents could name at least three "best friends," 15.2% were unable to list at least three best friends and 4.5% of their sample reported no best friends. Smith _et_ _al_. found socioeconomic differences in location of friends in this urban area. Lower socio-economic groups were more likely to have friends in the neighborhood, while higher socio-economic groups were more likely to have locality centered friends. These researchers did not differentiate between male and female respondents and, in fact, they did not specify the sex of their subjects in this study.

An early study by Axelrod (1956), using data from the Detroit area study, indicated that forty per cent of the respondents had seen a relative at least once per week and the most important type of informal social contact in the city (except for respondents in the highest social economic status brackets) was with relatives. Similarly Bell and Boat (1957), in a study of males in four San Francisco neighborhoods, found that informal relationships between friends and kin were frequent. Of these kin contact was the more important.

Garigue (1956), in a study of basically middle income French Canadians in Montreal, found extensive kin awareness, kin contact and kin reciprocity. Garigue saw the typically large French Canadian family as offering the opportunity to choose sibling friendships based upon similar interest. Garigue interprets the extensive urban kin network in French Montreal as neither a rural survival nor a consequence of shortened urban experiences. He suggests that it is part of the established values of the French Canadian culture and is in itself an urban life style.

Widely quoted research in Bethnal Green, a working class district in London's East End, indicated intense ties with kin. Young and Willmot (1957) found that the strongest ties were between mother and daughter. Over half of their female respondents had seen their mother ("mum") within the last 24 hours and about ninety per cent had visited their mother during the preceding week.

Greer and Kube (1959) studied four Los Angeles areas which were similar in socio-economic status and the fact that they had no visible ethnic group concentrations. The areas studied varied in level of urbanization. Urbanization was defined as "the proportion of wives who have outside jobs, the proportion of population living in single family dwellings, and the fertility ratio. The greater the proportion of working wives, the fewer the one-family residences and the lower the fertility rate, the higher the urbanization score" (Greer and Kube, 1959:93). Greer and Kube found through their interviews with female respondents that the quantity of social participation did not change in any dramatic way between areas. Primary relationships existed throughout the areas - in somewhat varying form. Family and friendship were of great importance in all areas (Greer and Kube, 1959:109).

Other studies appeared which indicated the importance of the context of availability. Zena Smith Blau's study of marital status, age and friendship patterns suggested that structural conditions strongly influence the friendship ties of people. Blau found that women who were widowed at an early age had difficulty retaining friendship ties. In contrast, however, women past the age of 65 who were not widowed had difficulty maintaining friendship ties. By this time so many of the other women their age were widowed that the still married found themselves outside these friendship circles.

Similarly, intensive interviews by Cumming and Schneider (1961) of adults between the age of fifty and eighty indicated that the highest morale was among widows and the lowest among older married women. However, for married women the presence of sisters tended to offset low morale. Cummings and Schneider also suggested that the sex differentials in mortality may make the older woman with a surviving spouse feel like a fifth wheel among other women. The presence of a sister, however, provides such a woman with a reasonably assured female friend.

Aida Tomeh (1964), in a study of metropolitan Detroit, compared the amount of informal social participation between three settlement patterns: inner city, six miles or less from the center of the business district; outer city, more than six miles from the center but within the city limits; and the suburban area. Her data indicate that the differences between participation in inner and outer city areas are small but participation increased across city limits. She found no differences for males and females. However, Tomeh found that blacks and single people had higher participation rates in the inner city zone than in the suburbs. The concentration of both of these groups is higher in the inner city, suggesting the importance of structural effects on interpersonal relationships. Tomeh suggests that such structural effects may be of greater importance to rates of participation than zone of residence. The studies of Blau (1961), Cumming and Schneider (1961) and Tomeh (1964) serve to suggest the importance of population composition and its relation to interpersonal bonds.

Eugene Litwak (1960a; 1960b; 1965) did research to determine whether an extended family orientation was detrimental to geographic or occupational mobility (following the classicist assumption that social and geographic mobility are needed in the modern industrial society). Using as his subjects 950 white mothers under 45 years in Buffalo, Litwak challenged the assumption that the isolated nuclear family is the most functional for contemporary industrial society. Litwak interprets his findings to suggest that an "extended family orientation" is not inconsistent with either occupational mobility (1960a) or geographic mobility (1960b). Litwak assumes the United States previously had an extended family pattern, but it has now moved into what he terms a "modified extended family." This, Litwak describes as

> . . . consisting of a coalition of nuclear families in a state of partial dependence. Such partial dependence means

> that nuclear family members exchange significant services with each other, thus differing from the isolated nuclear family, as well as retain considerable autonomy (that is, not bound economically or geographically), therefore differing from the classical extended family (Litwak, 1965:291).

In a study entitled The Urban Villagers, Herbert Gans (1962) studied the Italian working class community in the west end of Boston. Gans found a strong sense of community in this urban area. Residents of the area were person oriented and behavior was controlled through, among other things, a physical environment which facilitated surveillance of one's neighbors. Gans refers to an incident regarding boys from the community who were sent away from the city to have the "advantage" of summer camp and felt great loneliness away from their area. Gans' description is reminiscent of Zorbaugh's (1929) earlier observation regarding the recalcitrant slum dwellers who refused to be rehabilitated by being moved out of the slum. Gans, however, interprets this as a reflection on the rewards and supports of the community in contrast to Zorbaugh's interpretation, which did not allow for the interpersonal rewards of community life in a slum area.

Another study, by Liebow (1967), also suggests the importance of ethnicity. Liebow's study of lower-class black men followed a format quite similar to Whyte's earlier mentioned study of Italian street corner gangs. Whyte (1943) had criticized the failure of the Chicago school to see the organized aspects of slum life. In like manner, Liebow's work emphasizes close-knit primary ties among his urban lower-class subjects.

The relativist approach showed increasing sensitivity to sex differentials. Particularly in family studies, there was a broad awareness of the importance of the female (in her traditional role at least) in maintaining contacts with extended kin. Study after study has indicated major sex differences. For example, authors have noted the closeness of mother and daughter relationships in western society (e.g., Gans, 1962; Komarovsky, 1964). Sweetzer (1968:236) has noted that "a matrilateral emphasis in intergenerational relations is characteristic of families in urban industrial societies, despite the bilaterality of kinship norms." Garigue (1956) found French Canadian women in Montreal had greater awareness of the kin group and were the most active agents in maintaining kin ties and contacts. Adams (1968) found that Greensboro, North Carolina women had a greater sense of obligation to parents and were closer to them affectionately. Irving's (1972) Toronto study found that young husbands and wives were both more likely to confide in the wife's parents than in the husband's parents. The interesting research of Lowenthal and Haven (1968) suggests that among the San Francisco residents studied, women were more likely than men to have some form of intimate relationship with another person. Men who had such a relationship were most likely to have it with a wife. In contrast, women were more likely to indicate that their intimate relationship was with a child or friend.

More recently, historical analyses have appeared which provide additional arguments regarding the classic approach. A major work was Sjoberg's (1960) historical study of medieval Europe, traditional China and India which emphasized the importance of distinguishing between pre-industrial and industrial cities. Sjoberg faulted urban researchers for failing to make such distinctions earlier. Contrary to the classicist assumption, his data indicate the importance of the family in pre-industrialized cities and suggest that the large extended family was not characteristic of rural areas but was more likely to be found among those who could afford it - the urban upper-class. However, Sjoberg's research did not make comparisons with the available data, which suggest the importance of extended kin ties in industrialized urban areas.

The work of historian, Phillip Aries (1962) attracted the notice of family sociologists and continues to be referred to by those challenging the classicist argument. Aries argues that the western family has been moving toward a nuclear form since the thirteenth century. Similarly, Furstenberg's (1966) historical survey of family life in the United States suggests that the nuclear family form was characteristic before far-reaching urbanization and industrialization.

Still another historical analysis by Sennett (1970), a study of Chicago between 1872 and 1890 using census and city directory data, found that both sons and fathers residing in "extended" families (nuclear families with one or more extra adults in addition to parents) showed greater occupational mobility than those in nuclear family households. Sennett suggests that, contrary to the classicist position, the nuclear family unit may not be conducive to preparation for life in industrial society. Sennett reasons that, in an extended setting with more than one adult working, there is discussion of work in the home, hence children can profit from the work example. Sennett's interpretation of his data is not altogether convincing. Additionally, he is trying to explain a multivariate relationship by a single variable, that of family composition.

Another historical study suggesting that industrialization and extended familialism may mesh well is that by Anderson (1973). Studying an English industrial town of 70,000, he found that in 1851 there were more families living with kin in residence than a previous study of pre-industrial families had indicated. Anderson argues that, contrary to classical assumptions, one could well consider the benefits of three-generational families sharing residence — at least in the initial stages of industrialization. In such situations, older people could take care of children while both parents worked. Hence non-nuclear kin would actually be an economic asset.

A work which attempts to integrate and interpret divergent findings on urban industrial kin was published by William J. Goode in 1963. Goode studied family patterns covering a period of approximately fifty years in the West, the Isamic Arab World, Sub-Saharan Africa, India, China and Japan. Goode's basic proposition was that the social forces of urbanization and industrialization were working to produce some type of conjugal family pattern ". . .that is toward fewer kinship ties with distant relatives and a greater emphasis on the nuclear family unit of couple and children" (Goode, 1963:1). Goode qualifies this statement by suggesting: (1) that family systems begin at different historical points so that their convergence toward the ideal typical conjugal family may be at different rates of speed or in different directions; (2) the means by which industrialization or urbanization have impact is not clear; and (3) there is a need to consider the effect of ideology and value changes.

Good's book is a widely recognized and widely quoted contribution to the literature on the urban industrial family. The data, however, cover a short time period, hence it is hard to judge whether his findings represent a long-term trend or a short-term fluctuation. He implies that there may be various types of conjugal family, however he does not specify these. Additionally, the study does not differentiate between subtypes of industrialism or urbanism or distinguish between the impact of urbanism and the impact of industrialism. However, Goode's work represents a major effort to interpret and integrate diverse findings.

Still other research appeared which attempted to challenge the classical position by pointing out that there is no one-to-one relationship between urbanization, industrialization and the nuclear family. Research by Nimkoff and Middleton (1960) found that approximately half of the societies in their study have independent nuclear family units. This type of family, in fact, was substantially correlated with hunting-gathering cultures. In contrast, the extended family tended to be associated with settled agriculture and rights in land. Greenfield's (1961) research also posed a challenge by pointing out that the nuclear family is the idealized form of family life in the non-industrialized Barbadoes.

Similarly, a study by Burch (1967) using South American census data also challenged the idea that a common ancestral home (one of the frequent imputed accompaniments of extended family life) is characteristic of rural dwellers. Burch provided examples of situations where the average number of other relatives in households in urban areas was larger than in households in rural areas.

A recent Canadian study also challenges the classic approach. Howard Irving (1972), in a book entitled The Family Myth, studied middle and lower middle class Protestants of British origin living in Toronto. As evidence attacking the "myth" of the isolated nuclear family, Irving cites such findings as the following: eighty-six per cent of his respondents had parents and/or parents-in-law living in the metropolitan Toronto area; seventy five per cent visited their parents weekly or more often; and thirty eight per cent wished they could see their parents even more often. One-half of the sample had resided either with their parents or parents-in-law at some time since their marriage.

Other research suggests (predictably) that relationships may be more complicated than previously thought. Rosen's (1973) study of 167 lower class Brazilian families divided the respondents into four groups — plantation peasants, recent rural migrants to the city, established rural migrants and native urban dwellers. Rosen found a curvilinear relationship between equalitarianism, openness and responsiveness in the family. The high point was reached by established rural migrants. Although their social position was little different from the long-term rural resident, they had experienced, according to Rosen, a recent change for the better in contrast to the village life. Hence, in his study of achievement orientation, he found these families to be the most open and responsive — despite their urban environment. Oscar Lewis (1952) notes that such cross-cultural findings ". . .provide evidence that urbanization is not a single, unitary, universally similar process but assumes different forms and meanings, depending upon the prevailing historic, economic, social and cultural conditions."

Some writers have attempted to explain the qualifications on the isolated nuclear family hypothesis. Winch and Blumberg (1968), for example, suggest that in American society alone there may be at least three major familial types: (1) a nuclear unit embedded in an extended kin network; (2) an isolated nuclear family; and (3) a mother-child nuclear family.

The number of studies citing examples of one form or another of urban industrial kin contact has increased. These have been viewed by many writers as major challenges to the classical approach to the family. Some have gone as far as to declare the issue, in fact, resolved. Sussman, for example, is quoted as having made the following statement in 1965:

> The isolated nuclear family is a myth. This has already been conclusively demonstrated. It does not merit any further attention of the field, and I, for one, refuse to waste any more time even discussing it (Sussman quoted in Gibson, 1972:13).

Similarly, in a survey of studies relating to urban friendship, Greer (1962:91) concludes:

> Informal participation in friendship relations, with individual friends or friendship circles is an extremely frequent occurrence. Friendship, outside any organization context, is a near universal in the city, the urbanite is seldom completely isolated from this type of primary relationship.

Thus, in contrast to the major thrust of the classic approach to urban industrial social bonds, the empirical evidence comprising the relativist approach suggests major qualifications. Data from a large number of studies appear to refute the notion of loneliness, isolation and attenuated kinship ties and suggest the importance of both family and friendship. Additionally, the evidence suggests that these ties are relative to such factors as ethnicity, life style, social class and gender.

THE RELATIVIST APPROACH AND EARLIER ASSUMPTIONS

We will now turn to an examination of the relativist approach and its relation to the nine assumptions earlier delineated in the work of the European theorists. The purpose of this section is to determine whether and to what extent these nine assumptions permeate this approach.

1. The assumption that rural interpersonal relationships are superior to urban interpersonal relationships

As indicated in the examination of the pertinent writings of the three early European theorists, there was a strong tendency on the part of both Tönnies and Simmel to romanticize rural life. As a consequence, their judgments of urban life were deflected by pastoralist assumptions. The work of the classic approach, in this century, frequently reflected variants of the pastoralism found in the writings of Simmel and Tönnies. Rural kin and extra-kin ties were assumed to be significantly more rewarding than those of the city; social traits assumed to be characteristically rural were also usually broadly defined as the components of a rewarding relationship; and the social traits attributed to rural life are assumed to be either sharply attenuated in the city or, if present, to be atypical of urbanism.

The large amount of published research on rural and "simpler" societies was a potential benefit to the relativist approach. However, disciplinary distinctions between anthropological and sociological work have often worked against an appreciation for the findings of cultural anthropology. The major deviations from the traditional belief in rural warmth and tranquility reported by such writers as Lewis (1951) and Banfield (1958), among others, have been difficult for both sociologists and anthropologists to accept. Foster (1967) has recently observed that researchers frequently face problems in trying to internalize those accounts which defy the idyllic view of the rural "good life."[3] These findings go against strongly held cultural definitions. Several observers have commented on the continued tendency to romanticize rural life and rural social forms (e.g., Goode, 1973; Strauss, 1968; Wellman *et al.*, 1971).[4]

An interesting way in which pastoralism is currently reflected is in the use of rural based terminology to describe social conditions which appear to refute the classic position. For example, Gans (1962) refers to the Italian-Americans in Boston as "urban *villagers*" thereby perpetuating the belief that village ties are necessarily close-knit and supportive. (Banfield's (1958) study of an Italian village found evidence quite to the contrary). Other relativist studies are fond of referring to the village aspects of urban life (see Fischer, 1973). The frequent reference to "village-like" qualities to describe close-knit supportive ties in urban areas reflects a pastoralist bias. The lure of such terminology seems hard to escape. It will be recalled that Durkheim stood out for his cautious evaluations of rural life and for the fact that he did not castigate urban life (in contrast to Simmel and Tönnies). Durkheim was unique in suggesting that cities may have insulated areas which provide much socio-emotional support. However, Durkheim did not use village or rural terminology to describe these areas but instead referred to them as *cities within the city* (Durkheim, 1933:299). In doing this he avoided pastoralism and allowed for the possibility that the close-knit ties were in themselves urban characteristics. In fact, however, we do not yet have adequate evidence to know whether the urban "villages" are characteristic of urbanism or are a passing phase in the process of urbanization.

Similarly, relativist terminology with regard to the family often reflects the idealization of rural family life. For example, Litwick (1961a; 1961b) suggested the applicability of the term "modified extended family" as appropriately descriptive of family relationships in the United States. This term has been rather widely quoted. However, it invokes the belief in the earlier dominance of an extended family orientation. This is a belief, which as mentioned has been challenged by several observers (e.g., Furstenberg, 1966; Greven, 1973).

2. The assumed superiority of emotional in contrast to rational interpersonal relationships

3. The assumed superiority of role generalized as opposed to role specific relationships

4. The assumed superiority of enduring relationships in contrast to transitory relationships

Three assumptions regarding the favorable qualities of a social relationship were examined in the work of the European theorists. All three of these writers, Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel, shared the view that relationships which endured over time were superior to those of short duration. Simmel and Tönnies emphasized the superiority of relationships based upon emotionalism in contrast to those based upon rationality. With reference to role specific relationships, Tönnies was the only one of the three to assert that a role specific relationship is less rewarding than a role generalized one. Simmel was explicit in stating that the role specific relationship was not necessarily any less rewarding to the individuals involved than one which was role generalized.

The classicist approach tended to accept all three of the above social-psychological assumptions. These early writers frequently described both implicitly and explicitly the qualities of a good relationship. Given the limited base of empirical research data from which they could operate, the defining qualities of a rewarding relationship were frequently based on guesswork. However, unsubstantiated judgments regarding urban industrial interpersonal ties have continued to be made in the relativist approach in spite of the broader base of existing empirical studies from which it could draw. Insufficient attention has been given to developing measurements sensitive to the nuances of reward in interpersonal encounters.

We have grouped the discussion of assumptions two, three and four because they tend to appear as a group in the relativist writings. These social psychological attributes are, in fact, the qualities often assumed to be encompassed in the term "primary relationship." The distinctions between primary and secondary relationships are common in this literature. The concept of primary relationship is usually intended to be synonamous with a rewarding socio-emotional relationship. The family is considered as the prototype of a primary group. Standard (although admittedly varying) definitions of primary group encompass the characteristics of role pervasiveness and sometimes long duration and spontaneity. Cooley's original definition included the following:

> By primary groups I mean those characterized by intimate face-to-face association and cooperation. They are primary in several senses, but chiefly in that they are fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual. The result of intimate association, psychologically, is a certain fusion of individualities in a common whole. . . . The most important spheres of this intimate association and cooperation though by no means the only ones are the family, the playgroup of children and the neighborhood. . . . (Cooley, 1915:23-24).

Cooley's original definition is often altered. Davis' (1949:306) definition, for example, includes inclusive knowledge of the other and feelings of spontaneity. The defining qualities used by different writers are not the same; they are often not specified, yet we assume the term "primary" relationship to have an agreed upon and fairly precise meaning. There is a repeated tendency to assume that emotionality, long duration and role generalized relationships are superior to their opposites. These are social psychological assumptions which may well be valid. We are not attempting to make a case for their invalidity but we are emphasizing the need for further empirical test. These are important assumptions. They relate to the type of judgment passed upon urban industrial life and its interpersonal relationships. If one grants (and this is not yet adequately established) that rationality, role specific encounters and contacts of short duration are more frequently encountered in urban industrialized settings than in pre-urban or pre-industrial settings, a generally "negative" evaluation of the social rewards of these qualities will also color the perception of urban industrial interpersonal life. The work of the relativist approach has generally not drawn upon a valid, social psychological data base to support generalizations concerning the "good" interpersonal relationship.

5. The assumed validity of generalizations derived from unrepresentative categories

The work of Durkheim and Simmel on urban industrial interpersonal relationships gave minimal attention to the impact of sex, age or social class differences. Tönnies, in contrast, made an interesting attempt to account for differences in types of interpersonal relationships by equating Gemeinschaft natural will to those who were in what might be termed the traditionally less powerful positions in society, i.e., the less educated, the economically disadvantaged, women and the young. The classicist approach tended, on the whole, to give minimal attention to sex, class or ethnic differences in the sense of incorporating them into their explanatory framework.

In contrast, the relativist approach has been sensitive to class, ethnic and other background variations. Thus, researchers have cited the important influence on social bonds of ethnicity (Gans, 1962; Winch and Blumberg, 1968), life style (Leibow, 1967; Michelson, 1970), social class (Gans, 1962; Greer, 1962; Irving, 1971), age (Rosow, 1967) and sex (Garigue, 1956; Bott, 1957; Gans, 1962; Komarovsky, 1964; Adams, 1968; Sweetzer, 1968; Irving, 1972) and the context of availability (Blau, 1961; Cumming and Schneider, 1961; Tomeh, 1964).

A major deficiency of the revisionist approach has been with regard to marital categories. Family is narrowly and traditionally defined. Few studies have considered the impact of marital status on adult contact with parents, siblings and other relatives. Theorizing has focused on a "Noah's Ark" society where most adults come in pairs without giving sufficient attention to the kinship implications of various forms of marital status. Research in the United States by Gibson (1972) is an initial step toward remedying this deficiency. Gibson's findings suggest that single adults are most integrated into the larger kin network followed by the widowed and the divorced. Nuclear units (as the classic approach in fact argues) were the most isolated in terms of extended kin contact. Large numbers of divorced and single people have been overlooked in research on kinship extension. This omission is a form of continuation of the earlier assumption of the adequacy of generalizations based upon unrepresentative categories. Family ties have frequently been examined with a single family form in mind. The validity of the resulting generalizations for different family types has yet to be ascertained.

6. The assumption that urbanism and industrialism are static phenomena

Urbanism and industrialization continue in the relativist approach to be cited as variables related to changes in socio-emotional relationships. Some of the same problems which characterized the work of the European theorists and the classic approach are repeated in the relativist approach.

For example, urban areas are frequently defined by size. Miner (1953) referred to Timbuctoo as a city, although it had a population of 6,000. In contrast, Abu-Lughod (1960) refers to Garawan, Egypt with a population of some 8,000 as a village. The United States Bureau of the Census takes 2,500 as a cut-off point between rural and urban, while Keyes (1958) suggests that 25,000 is a reasonable cut-off point for the United States. Gibbs and Davis (1958) assert that, for international comparisons, a cut-off point of 10,000 is appropriate, while Sjoberg (1965) claims that in cross-cultural research, size alone is not an adequate determinant of urbanism. Sjoberg notes that a city of 5,000 in Mexico is different from one of 5,000 in the United States. Certainly the development of reliable indices of urbanism is a thesis in itself in the field of urban sociology. Variations on Wirth's early distinction between the components of size, density, and heterogeneity have been attempted. However, although size has long been recognized as problematic, it is a frequently used indicator of urbanism in this literature.

In the research on interpersonal relationships there has frequently been inadequate distinction made between established urban areas and industrialized areas and those undergoing rapid growth. The stage of development is an important consideration. Second and third generation participants may have quite different adaptations to family and friendship and in addition may have low rates of inter-urban geographic mobility. Additionally studies of rural migrants suggest that there are many variations between types of migrants and their urban adaption (see Brody, 1969).

Sjoberg's (1960) historical research sensitized others to distinguishing between pre-industrial and industrial cities. However, modern industrialism is still often not distinguished from urbanism (see Goode, 1963). The examination of the impact of industrialization on social bonds has suffered from lack of differentiation between various forms of industrialization from single company towns to multi-industrial cities.[5]

Urbanization and industrialization continue to be cited in the literature as variables of major significance to the quality of modern social life. However, as concepts they present problems. Hartley (1968) uses the phrase the "jingle fallacy" to refer to the idea that if two or more things are called by the same name they are assumed to be the same. It may be argued that both urbanization and industrialization suffer from the "jingle fallacy" in that both are often used to imply a wide range of processes. As explanatory concepts they may attempt too much, given that scientific analysis needs to follow the principle of Occam's razor, i.e., the law of parsimony.

7. The assumption of a unidirectional path to modernity

Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel all tended to assume a unidirectional path to modernity. Traditional societies were seen as almost inevitably succumbing to the forces of modernization. The assumption of the eventual global unity of humankind was also reflected in the classic approach often through the dominant assimilationist perspective. In contrast, the relativist approach has exhibited greater sensitivity to divergent forms of modernity. The older assimilationist perspective has been at least partially tempered by several observers. Divergent ethnic adaptations may be of long duration. They may not necessarily succumb (or indeed may not be allowed to succumb) to the dominant culture (Lieberson, 1961; Horton, 1966; Metzger, 1971).

While there has been greater appreciation for the sociological importance of cultural and sub-cultural differences, interpretations of non-western social behavior are sometimes imposed from the outside rather than judged in cultural context. This practice can be seen as another manifestation of the assumed global unity of humankind (Northrup and Livingston, 1964; Etzioni and Dubow, 1970; Alatas, 1972). This practice acts to make suspect the appropriateness of many relativist studies.

8. The assumed sufficiency of an ahistorical analysis

As discussed in the earlier chapters, Tönnies and Simmel gave scant attention to historical data in their major works. A similar tendency was reflected in the early classical approach. This occurred despite the fact that sociology in its initial development had strong links with history. The writings of the relativist period suggest a slowly developing appreciation for historical data. Until very recently there were few historical studies of the family with much scholarly repute (Goode, 1963; Berkner, 1973). Sjoberg's (1960) analyses stimulated interest in historical differences in the city and other works have followed somewhat sporadically (e.g., Furstenberg, 1966; Sennett, 1970). North American sociology is only very recently becoming aware of the possible utility of historical data. Such data is not only useful but essential in studies which attempt to explain long range societal trends. There is much historical material available on the city (Powell, 1968). Demographic historians have been conducting some interesting research on the historical family. Census manuscripts and parish records provide information regarding births, deaths, patterns of re-marriage and so on. Increasingly while some sociologists have become appreciative of the possibilities in historical materials, some historians have become more appreciative of quantification and the use of sociological concepts (Gordon, 1973). The need for reliable historical data is particularly pressing in the work on modern social bonding because of its explicit comparison point in the past. However, there is a general dearth of studies using primary historical data by sociologists. Nor are sociologists being trained in historiography. This lack is still reflected in the literature on the family, extra-kin ties and the urban industrial setting.

9. The assumed adequacy of culture bound data for generalizations about humankind

The work of Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel, and the work of the classical approach to urban industrial social bonds, were characterized by very limited use of cross-cultural comparisons. It was the dearth of supportive cross-cultural evidence which made the classic approach vulnerable to attack from the relativist approach. As cross-cultural studies began to accumulate, many from anthropological field work, the validity of earlier generalizations was called into question. The culturally limited focus of the classic studies and their frequent failure to point to the limitations in the generalizability of their findings can be attributed to several factors, some operating individually and others in concert: the limited funds for cross-cultural research; the then relatively narrow problem oriented focus of sociology in the United States; some erroneous extrapolations from United States' based data to humanity in general; and finally, the errors of readers who sometimes embraced findings specific to a given setting and generalized them beyond their intended limits. In addition, and in contrast to anthropology, cross-cultural work using many of the traditional tools of sociology seemed particularly difficult to transfer into a quite different cultural setting.

The relativist approach, while appreciative of cross-cultural data, has often overlooked an important dimension. This is a dimension which reflects an aspect of the above assumption of the European theorists and the classical approach. The meaning of behaviors is often imposed from outside rather than judged in cultural context. For example, evidence suggesting the existence of urban friend or extended kin support in non-western urban industrial settings usually does not indicate whether these social ties are different from village settings in the same culture. The discovery of such relationships by Western researchers says little about how the participants themselves judge the quality of their socio-emotional ties. The cultural context of such relationships has not been adequately considered. To find a higher number of kin visitations in urban Cairo than in the United States may suggest to a western observer (e.g., Petersen, 1969) that extended kin ties are strong but Egyptians may use other indications to define strength of kin ties. Do the residents of Cairo or Tokyo believe that the quality of family or extra-kin ties were better in pre-urban or pre-industrial periods and, if so, does this influence their judgments regarding their own socio-emotional ties?[6] The meaning of extended family or friendship in its cultural context has not been sufficiently explored by researchers.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Of the nine assumptions which have been examined through the articulation of the European and classic approach to urban industrial social bonds, some have made their way into the research in the relativist tradition. This more recent genre of research is the currently dominant approach. However, it is far from being integrated by an explanatory theoretical framework. It has acted to set up qualifiers on the classic approach. The relativist approach continues to manifest examples of pastoralist evaluations regarding rural interpersonal life. The positive evaluation of emotional, enduring and role pervasive relationships over their opposites, finds its way, still untested, into this approach through the very common distinction between primary and secondary groups. Methodologically there are the beginnings of interest in historical analysis - at least in the use of secondary data. There has also been a broad cross-cultural emphasis facilitated by a supportive financial as well as intellectual climate. However, the cross-cultural research frequently interprets behavior without sufficient appreciation of the cultural context. Urbanization and industrialization as explanatory concepts in this field are commonly used but still not well clarified. The assumption of a one-way theory of modernity has been generally qualified, however it sometimes reappears under the guise of western perceptual blinders. We thus see distinct progress in some spheres regarding the examination, testing or challenging of earlier assumptions and other areas which still reflect the earlier assumptions common to the European and classic traditions. The final chapter will suggest research foci which may aid in clarifying some of these issues.

CHAPTER SEVEN

FOOTNOTES

1. Komarovsky (1955:231-232) quotes from the following textbooks illustrating the attitude toward parental attachments:

> If there is a bona-fide in-law problem the young couple need first of all to be certain of their perspective. The success of their marriage should be put above everything else, even above attachment to parents. Husband and wife must come first. Otherwise the individual exhibits immaturity (M.A. Bowman, Marriage for Moderns, p. 328).
>
> Close attachments to members of the family, whether parents or siblings, accentuate the normal difficulties involved in achieving the response role expected in marriage (H. Becker and R. Hill, Marriage and the Family, p. 349).
>
> . . .there is a call for a new attitude, a subordinating of and to some extent an aloofness from the home of one's childhood (E.R. Groves, Marriage, 1933, p. 274).
>
> Do not live with or in the neighborhood of your relatives and in-laws, and do not allow them to live with you (H. Hart, Personality and the Family, p. 199).

2. At the time of writing The Folk Culture of Yucatan, Redfield was aware of Tax's work. However, he handled it not by questioning the validity of the attributes at either end of his dichotomous classificatory scheme, but rather suggesting that there may be, in addition, other "causes" for secularization and individualization. ". . .The Yucatan materials. . . induce the writer to propose that increase of contacts, bringing about heterogeneity and disorganization of culture, constitutes one sufficient cause of secularization and individualization. And the case of Guatemala. . . suggests that the development of important commerce and a money economy may be another such sufficient cause" (Redfield, 1941:369). Redfield also wrote on the Guatemalan merchants (1939), however, with a thrust different from that of Tax. . . concluding that "a preliterate life with a local culture and the personal and magical attitude toward nature which is characteristic of the primitive world is quite compatible with commercialism and a pecuniary economy" (Redfield, 1939, 1962:209).

Later, Redfield attempted to explain the evidence of Sol Tax that Guatemalan Indians in non-industrialized villages have weak family institutions. Redfield stated that:

> . . .in the case of the. . .(preindustrialized). . . Guatemalan societies the development, partly before the Conquest and partly afterward, of a pecuniary economy with a peddler's commerce, based on great regional division of labor, together with a system of regulations imposed by an elite, with the use of force, may be the circumstances that have brought about reduction in the importance of familial institutions and individual independence, especially in matters of livelihood (Redfield, 1947:252).

3. Foster (1967) asserts that some English words which, in his view, are necessary to use in evaluating peasant cultures, carry unavoidably value-laden connotations, e.g., cooperative, hard-working, competitive, critical, gossipy and friendly. However, one could well argue that the English language has a great deal more flexibility than Foster gives credit.

4. With regard to the influence of pastoralist ideology on social scientists, Strauss (1968) makes the assertion that the writings of sociologists essentially parallel and are not necessarily any more sophisticated than those in the popular media. In Strauss' view:

> Indeed, virtually all the important urban sociologists in any decade. . . can, without stretching credulity, be viewed as articulate spokesmen, excellent rhetoricians, for less sophisticated versions of the same views about cities (Strauss, 1968:516).

5. Winch and Blumberg (1968:1972) have attempted to study extendedness of kin against the variable of societal complexity. By societal complexity they refer to the institutional arrangement for providing for societal subsistence, i.e., either hunting and gathering, sedentary agriculture or industrial. Thus they group together various forms of industrial societies.

6. Vidich and Bensman (1960) in their study of a small upstate New York community of 2,500 suggest that the layman's definition of rural life influences his behavior. They assert that in "Springdale" there is a strong identification of the community as a good place to live in contrast to neighboring areas.

> It is interesting that the belief in the superiority of local ways of living actually conditions the way of life. Springdalers 'make an effort to be friendly' and 'go out of their way' to help newcomers (Vidich and Bensman, 1960:32).

Vidich and Bensman's methodology is generally vague and the empirical basis for the above conclusion hard to evaluate. However, their observation suggests hypotheses which would be interesting to put to empirical test.

CHAPTER EIGHT

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

The object of this study has been to examine the trend of sociological research with reference to a specific area of concern, namely, the nature of urban industrial social bonds. Our examination started with late nineteenth century Europe and the pertinent writings of three major theorists, Ferdinand Tönnies, Emile Durkheim and Georg Simmel. Nine prevalent assumptions were isolated from the works of these theorists. Following this, we examined the pioneering studies of urban industrial social bonds carried out by exponents of the American classic approach, with a view to determining whether and the extent to which the nine assumptions of European theorists permeated early American research. We then concluded with an examination of the empirical challenge to the classical approach which has been posed by the relativists in the past two decades. The relativist approach was also examined against the earlier nine assumptions. The results of this analysis suggest that several of the assumptions of the earlier European forefathers have followed through to succeeding generations of sociologists and have sometimes been taken as self-evident truths.

While the focus of this study has been the common assumptions characterizing the sociological approach to the study of modern social bonds, the results have, implicitly or explicitly, revealed a theme of incrementalism of ideas, each building upon its predecessor. Nevertheless, the main interest of this study is not so much the evolution of ideas as the attempt to characterize the climate of sociological thought during different eras. We feel we must reiterate again Schopenhauer's observation that ". . . it is much easier to point out the faults and errors in the work of a great mind than to give a distinct and full exposition of its value." In pointing out limitations in the work of major social thinkers, we intend less a criticism of them and their ideas than a warning to those who have used this work without sifting carefully for some shortcomings. As noted by Merton (Coser, 1971:viii)

> . . . if we confine ourselves to pious commentary on the founding fathers instead of trying to develop their ideas through further cumulative efforts, we decline into scholasticism rather than advance into scholarship.

The critical examination of the assumptions underlying the work on urban industrial social bonding as well as the evidence upon which this is based, underlines the state of indeterminancy in this area. There has yet to be a clear statement of the problem, much less a clear provision of empirical answers regarding whether and to what extent modern humankind is suffering an attenuation of social support ties.

This dissertation has focused on the extent to which the assumptions delineated in the work of Tönnies, Durkheim and Simmel have carried over into several generations of research. As a result of this analysis, we suggest that there are some particular issues to which attention should be drawn. Among these are (1) conceptual handicaps; (2) inattention to the possible relationship between patterns of social bonds and the life histories of families or individuals; (3) issues regarding cross-temporal and cross-cultural analyses; and (4) failure to develop empirical measures of the quality of interpersonal ties. Each of these issues will be discussed in turn.

NEW CONCEPTS

Various writers have suggested that modern society is moving in the direction of greater geographical mobility (Jennings, 1970); more short-lived relationships (Bennis, 1968) and greater socio-emotional contact outside the family unit (Constantine and Constantine, 1973; Otto, 1973). To examine the validity of these characterizations, sociologists may well need concepts which are sensitive to new forms of relationship. The inadequacy of the traditional concept of "family" has been suggested by some writers and attempts have been made, in the face of alternative "family" forms and new life-styles, to develop new definitions of the family. Weigirt and Thomas (1971) feel that such new definitions would aid investigators to avoid the fallacy and value position of "socio centrism" by which they mean the "absolutizing" of a past structure.

Donald Ball (1970) is one writer who focuses on re-defining the family in an attempt to provide a concept which also encompasses homosexual unions and communal groups. Ball proposes that the family be re-defined as a unit consisting of "domestic and sexually consequential cohabitation." By sexually consequential Ball means that the unit either is providing (or has provided) sexual gratification for its members and/or has produced off-spring. While Ball's re-definition of the family may represent an advancement over earlier definitions, it does not cover family units consisting of single parents with adopted children, marital relationships which have never been sexually consummated or other variant family forms.

One can appreciate the intent in re-defining the family unit, for there are recognized "family-like" forms which require conceptual coverage. Anthropologists, for example, have explored the implications of kin terminology as applied to those in non-kin relationships (Pitt Rivers, 1968).[1] However, there are in addition other types of potentially intense interpersonal relationships which also warrant recognition in the lexicon of social science. Examples of these include communal religious brotherhoods, intense friendships, wartime buddy relationships, and the like. These relationships may provide substantial socio-emotional rewards such as are provided by some consanguineal and marital relationships.

The results of this study suggest that in addition to re-defining age-old concepts such as the family, there is considerable merit in developing new concepts which cut across kin and extra-kin barriers, and are also sensitive to variations in the degree of interpersonal rewards in either kin or extra-kin relationships. To this date, the sociologists' major conceptual tools for distinguishing between "more rewarding" and "less rewarding" interpersonal relationships have been the concepts of primary and secondary relationships, the assumption being that family is a primary relationship. There are problems with these concepts relating to: lack of agreement on their defining qualities, empirical substantiation of their co-variance, and insufficient test of their socio-emotional relevance.

It is here argued that a broadening of our concepts to cover both kin and extra-kin ties in terms of relationships serves the purpose of eliminating some redundancy in empirical investigations regarding social bonds; may provide a broader conceptual umbrella for theory development and, finally, may motivate researchers to assume a less romanticized view of the family and to examine the characteristics held in common by those interpersonal relationships in complex societies which either meet or do not meet the relatedness needs of individuals. Up to this point, sociology has focused more upon the culturally defined label (i.e., friend, spouse, co-worker) rather than examining the component parts which define a "rewarding relationship."

ASPECTS OF LIFE HISTORY

The examination of various aspects of the life history of individuals or families may reveal patterns in interpersonal bonding that even have cross-cultural counterparts. For example, as indicated earlier, there is research evidence which suggests that people of different marital statuses are differentially integrated into the larger family context. Gibson's (1972) research indicated that the highest degree of integration into the larger kin network characterized single adults, followed by the widowed, the divorced, and the married, in that order. Variation in family patterns throughout the life history of people needs to be considered. What is the impact of remarriage on extended kin ties? What is the impact of the pre-parental, parental and post-parental nuclear family phases on extended kin contact?

While evidence suggests the important role which women play in the maintenance of kin ties, the implications of this evidence remain to be adequately explored. This, too, may be done in a life history context. What is the impact of employment on the married woman's contact with kin? Is there a sharing between working husband and working wife in maintaining and initiating kin contacts? What changes occur in the retired male's relations with kin? Changing definitions of sex role behavior may provide the opportunity to obtain important insights which would facilitate a broader understanding of factors associated with interpersonal attachments.

Similarly, examination of a family unit over time may reveal periods of intense kin contact beyond the nuclear unit. A historical study of eighteenth century Austrian families by Berkner (1973), for example, suggested that by following nuclear units over time rather than relying on statistics from aggregate data, a larger proportion of them than earlier research had suggested had had experience with extendedness at some point in time.

Similarly, a recent Toronto study (Irving, 1972) indicated that of the sample of Canadian born, lower-middle class, Anglo Saxon Protestants married fifteen years or less, one-half had resided with either parents or parents-in-law at some time since their marriage. Although there are variant operationlizations of "extendedness" in the literature, one of the most stringent usually refers to families living together under the same roof. If we were to examine the extent to which North American families have shared their home with non-nuclear relatives at some point in their life history, we might find a much higher incidence of extendedness than would usually be expected.

Similarly, if studies were done on a cross-cultural basis in cultures traditionally assumed to have some form of extended family, we may find major variations over the life cycle of the family in the intensity of contact with non-nuclear kin. While recognizing that crisis situations probably are a common unifying factor, even within traditional societies, the housing, financial or emotional demands and rewards of extended kinship may vary greatly over time and circumstance. An understanding of these may give greater insight into contextual influences which may mesh or conflict with value preferences.

CROSS-CULTURAL AND CROSS-TEMPORAL RESEARCH

There is a combined need for more cross-temporal research and for greater ingenuity and innovativeness in cross-cultural research. We shall take each in turn.

There has been a consistent lack of interest in historiography in the works considered in this study. Only recently have steps been taken to change this situation in sociology. Ahistoricism presents particular problems in research on social bonds, mainly because of the implication of change from an earlier point in time. All too often, this implication is imprecise and/or misleading. Particularly in the area of the family, there is an abundant supply of "oral history" available. The dangers of relying on this for anything other than what it represents (i.e., what respondents say they believe happened) should well be appreciated.[2] Goode (1963:6) has called attention to the dangers of relying on beliefs in "the classical family of Western nostalgia." By this term, Goode is referring to a popular belief in an earlier period where the family represented a self-sufficient collectivity of several generations living a happy, interdependent life on the family farm. As historical data accumulates, sociologists are beginning to be aware of the problems with such romanticized versions of the past.

However, the gap between awareness of the utility of historical data and the ability to use it is wide. If we are uncomfortable with the problems of selective recall in gathering "oral histories," it is not reassuring, yet also not unexpected, to learn that historians, too, may operate under some romanticized views. Sjoberg has noted that some more literary-oriented historians have a propensity

> . . . to 'make history live' to the extent that they may be guilty (from the biased view of the scientifically oriented social scientist) of overpersonalization of their data - even of romanticism (Sjoberg, 1960:20).

Similarly, historical writings tend to be somewhat biased in favor of evolution as opposed to devolution. Charles Tilly (1970) notes that history abounds with examples of devolution such as the movement toward "pastoralization" in France between 1750 and 1850, a period when previously scattered industrial producers concentrated in the cities and, thus, freed many French communities to become more "rural" as they focused more singularly on agriculture. Unfortunately, Tilly feels that these devolutionary changes have been frequently overlooked by historians for there is a broader interest in a workable theory of development than a workable theory of "decline" (Tilly, 1970:462). We may also note, although Tilly does not mention this, that there may be planned devolution. For example, a social movement may work to reverse family life to the status quo ante. Evidence regarding devolution challenges postulates of irreversibility and unidirectionality; however, to get to this evidence it may well be necessary for sociologists to forego reliance on secondary data and to familiarize themselves with the techniques of historical analysis.

There is a need in sociology to overcome the unwritten assumption that an ahistorical approach is sufficient. This may be achieved not only by developing the appreciation for secondary historical data, but also by the recognition that primary historical data is a valuable research resource, as well as a tool for unobtrusive measurement. The use of historical data insures that sociologists are sensitive to the fact that all that went on before industrialization or urbanization is not a monolithic entity. We need reliable historical data to be able to intelligently interpret the relationship between urban industrialism and social bonds. As Thernstrom (1970:29) has observed, "the real choice is between explicit history, based on a careful examination of the sources, and implicit history rooted in ideological preconceptions and uncritical acceptance of local mythology."

While appreciation for the utility of cross-temporal evidence may have lagged, the cross-cultural perspective has been emphasized in recent years. However, much of the information which we now rely upon regarding pre-industrial, pre-urban societies is, in fact, from the field ethnographies of anthropologists. Hence, in attempting to use contemporary data as a source of comparison between urban industrialized and rural pre-industrialized settings we are often dependent upon the observations of a single observer. Some thirty years ago, Ralph Linton recognized this as a potential problem and noted

> The only check on such potential sources of error which is possible at the present time is to have each society studied by several investigators. These investigators should work independently and should be as diverse in their own personality configurations as possible (Linton, 1945:40).

A recent proposal, reminiscient of Linton's early suggestion, is that of D.T. Campbell (1970). Campbell suggests that the same unit of observation be examined from independent points of observation — a kind of triangulation of observers. Varying blends of cultures and researchers could be combined and their agreement and disagreements on cultural traits examined. Although there would still be indeterminancies regarding the validity of observations, multiple ethnographer studies would provide a means of examining these to determine which are suggestive of individual bias, which a product of interaction between subject and observer and which characteristic of the culture in question. Campbell suggests that researchers from diverse cultures be used. Campbell's suggestion focuses on ethnographic research but can be seen in variant form as most useful to any type of cross-cultural research including survey research. We are now at a point in sociology where we have many trained researchers from diverse ethnic backgrounds. An adaptation of Campbell's technique seems valid and accessible to students attempting to study the quality of interpersonal ties in cultures which are basically alien to them.

Arnold Rose (1967) has cautioned that some of our research techniques may, in practice, be self-fulfilling prophecies. The methods employed may produce findings conforming to our hypothesis. This warning may be particularly applicable to cross-cultural research. Western observers who do research in an alien environment (or those operating within their own national setting on an alien sub-group) may well project their own interpretations onto their subjects' behavior and use research instruments which facilitate those interpretations. For example, the judgments of an outside observer and the measurements which he uses may appear to indicate extended family ties and lack of urban anonymity in Tokyo, Cairo or Bombay.[3] However, in order to examine interpersonal relationships in their cultural context, a variant on Campbell's suggested method of triangulation of observers may well prove useful.

QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIPS

The indices of interpersonal ties have been problematic. The focal question with regard to urban industrial kin and extra-kin ties concerns the quality of interpersonal interaction in modern society. However, the measurement techniques have usually focused on frequency or kind of interaction rather than quality of interaction. Hence, studies have used as indicators of social ties contact via letters, phone calls, social gatherings or the provision of space for visiting relatives.[4] The diverse indicators of friendship or extended kin orientation have usually not dealt with quality of contact.

One study which attempted to measure quality of interaction between friends was that of Guterman (1968). In his study of white-collar and managerial hotel employees, Guterman developed what he referred to as an index of intimacy. His index included the dimensions of intensity (strength of affect), extensity (measured by a question regarding the range of topics discussed with each friend), duration and interconnectedness (as per Bott, 1957). Guterman's reporting of the procedure followed in coding his intimacy index is incomplete; however, it suggests an attempt to specify component parts of interpersonal intimacy.

Similarly, Levy (1966) suggests that kin solidarity may be broken down into at least three component parts, *intensity* (strength of affect), *strength* (priority in which relationship stands), and *contact* (type of relationship). As can be seen, there is some overlap between the categories proposed by Levy and those used by Guterman.

Marsh (1967) has also suggested analyzing kin solidarity in terms of three components which he delineated as: (1) number of people in the kin network; (2) the extent of interdependence; and (3) the extent to which kin ties take precedence over non-kin ties. He suggested that these may each vary independently of one another.

The importance of *quality* relationships as opposed to quantity is emphasized in the research by Lowenthal and Haven (1968). Their data on older Americans indicates that the existence of an intimate relationship was more highly related to high morale and good mental health than either role status or high amounts of social interaction. The presence of an intimate confidant was measured by the question, "Is there anyone in particular you confide in or talk to about yourself or your problems?" (Lowenthal and Haven, 1968:22).

If quality of social interaction proves to be a more important variable than quantity, the extent to which social relationships in urban industrial areas can be characterized as a zero-sum game may well be explored. Bott (1957), Tomeh (1964) and Shulman (1971) have referred to the possible additive nature of social relationships. By this, they mean that there may be a maximum number of close relationships which a person can have. Foster's (1967) application of the idea of the limited good to peasant societies may be more broadly applicable. If the possible number of close friends is circumscribed and perhaps as well the number of effectively functioning family members (which Simmel had in fact suggested), this adds another dimension to studying rural-urban differences. The distinction between quantity and quality of interpersonal relationships should be further explored.

A CONCLUDING OBSERVATION

Futurists have predicted that the western world (or, at least, some parts thereof) may be moving toward "mobicentricity" (Jennings, 1970). In such a setting, the demands of the work world will require that people move into temporary work modules set up on an ad hoc basis. Bennis has suggested that modern society may be moving, in fact, from the bureaucracy to the "ad-hocracy" (Bennis, 1968). In such a setting, people will have to attune themselves more than ever before to relationships which are focused, short-lived and based on rationality rather than emotionality; in short, what have been traditionally defined as "secondary" relationships. In a similar vein, Kantor (1972) has suggested that the short-lived anarchistic commune, as one of several possible forms of communal living groups, is a new alternative on the North American scene which may well satisfy the perceived needs of a segment of the population. The social psychological assumptions and orientation provided by many of the writings surveyed would label the "ad-hocracy" and the temporary commune as examples of decreasing interpersonal rewards for the people involved. However, we need more reliable evidence. We cannot predict the impact of projected social settings of the future when we still have to develop mechanisms appropriate for judging the rewards of social settings of the present.

L.L. Whyte (Koestler, 1964:175) has observed: "The awkward fact that reason, as we know it, is never aware of its hidden assumptions has been too much for some philosophers, and even many scientists to admit." This study has attempted to delineate some of the hidden assumptions which have appeared in much of the sociological research on urban industrial social bonding in the belief that an awareness of these assumptions may clarify some research issues in this area. Throughout the discussions of the works of Tönnies, Durkheim, Simmel, the classicist approach and the relativist approach, the focus has been on a specific common theme, the imputed dimunition of social support ties in modern life. Sociological attempts to determine the nature of modern family and friendship ties have often continued to exhibit assumptions common to the work of nineteenth century social thinkers. These are assumptions which have colored and sometimes constricted research efforts. It is a popularly held belief that modern social bonds have not only changed but are less rewarding than those of a preceding era. This is a theme of ancient duration; however, its validity is far from having been established. The current challenge for sociology is to set aside some earlier assumptions, and move beyond the level of folk wisdom; not because folk wisdom is necessarily invalid, but because it needs to be subjected to adequate empirical test.

CHAPTER EIGHT

FOOTNOTES

1. Pitt Rivers (1968) makes a distinction between consanguineal or affinal kinship and "pseudo-kinship." Pseudo-kinship refers to non-kin relationships which are labeled with kin terms. He lists three types: (1) figurative kin terminology which may be only a convention of speech (as, for example, children refering to a female family friend as "auntie"; (2) "fictive" or "artificial" kinship which is kinship by attribution, as, for example, in the Japanese practice of the mukoyoshi or adopted "groom-foster-son" role; and (3) ritual kinship which refers to ties of blood brotherhood, ritual co-parenthood or god-parent and god child relations.

2. Thernstrom has cited as an example of the possible errors resulting from ahistoricism, the Yankee City studies of Lloyd Warner (Thernstrom, 1970). Warner had an aversion to relying on what he saw as the "bias" of historical interpretations. For this reason Warner relied on "oral history" in his study of Yankee City. While people's beliefs regarding their past are significant data in some research contexts, Warner used these as a baseline for examining community change. These memories were later proven by other investigators to have been quite inaccurate and to have been a misleading influence on Warner's interpretations.

3. One could attempt perhaps to make a case for a current romanticization of non-western urbanity on the part of western sociologists. Behavior is imputed without knowledge of how the participants themselves evaluate their situation. It almost appears that there is a rush to judge the non-western, urban industrial world as personifying something akin to the earlier stereotypes about rural life. For example, Abu-Lughod's (1961) study of migrant villagers' adjustment to the city of Cairo very carefully stated that the suggestions that Wirth's view of the anonymous, impersonal city might not be substantiated in Cairo were hypotheses. However, what Abu-Lughod qualified as hypotheses have been rephrased and treated as facts by other sociologists (e.g., Sjoberg, 1965b:226; Marsh, 1967:197; Shannon and Shannon, 1967:56); Tilly and Brown, 1967:145). It has remained for Petersen (1971) to report an initial step toward providing the beginnings of empirical test of Abu-Lughod's hypotheses regarding Cairo.

4. Litwak's widely cited study relating extended family orientation to geographic and social mobility, upon which he based his concept "the modified extended family" relied on a questionable measure of extendedness.

Litwak measured extended family orientation by the following three questions:

1. Generally I like the whole family to spend evenings together;
2. I want a house where family members can spend time together;
3. I want a location which would make it easy for relatives to get together;
4. I want a house with enough room for our parents to feel free to move in (Litwak, 1961a; 1961b).

Those respondents in agreement with items 3 and 4 were labeled as "extended family" oriented. Those in agreement with only 1 and 2 were nuclear family oriented, and those disagreeing altogether were non-family oriented.

In this study, Litwak found that those who had an "extended family orientation" were no less likely to be geographically mobile.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abegglen, James C.
1968 "Continuity and Change in Japanese Industry," in Sylvia Fleis Fava (ed.) *Urbanism in World Perspective: A Reader*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.

Abu-Lughod, Janet
1961 "Migrant Adjustment to City Life: The Egyptian Case," *American Journal of Sociology* 67: 22-32.
1968 "The City is Dead - Long Live the City: Some Thoughts on Urbanity," in Sylvia Fleis Fava, (ed.) *Urbanism in World Perspective: A Reader*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.

Adams, Bert N.
1966 "Coercion and Consensus Theories: Some Unresolved Issues," *American Journal of Sociology* 71: 714-717.
1967 "Interaction Theory and the Social Network," *Sociometry* 30: 64-78.
1968 *Kinship in an Urban Setting*, Chicago: Markham Publishing Company.
1970 "Isolation, Function and Beyond: American Kinship in the 1960's," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 33: 575-597.

Aiken, Michael and Paul Mott (eds.)
1970 *The Structure of Community Power*, New York: Random House.

Alatas, Syed Hussein
1972 "The Captive Mind in Development Studies," *International Social Science Journal* 24: 9-25.

Aldous, Joan
1968 "Urbanization, the Extended Family, and Kinship Ties in West Africa," in Sylvia Fleis Fava (ed.) *Urbanism in World Perspective: A Reader*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.

Ammar, Hamed
1954 *Growing Up in an Egyptian Village: Silwa, Province of Aswan*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Anderson, Michael
1973 "Family, Household, and the Industrial Revolution," in Michael Gordon (ed.) *The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective*, New York: St. Martin's Press. 59-75.

Anderson, Nels
1961 *The Hobo*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Appelbaum, Richard P.
1970 Theories of Social Change, Chicago: Markham.

Aries, Philippe
1962 Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Axelrod, Morris
1956 "Urban Structure and Social Participation," American Sociological Review 21: 14-18

Axworthy, L. and James M. Gillies
1973 The City: Canada's Prospects Canada's Problems, Toronto: Butterworth and Company.

Baali, Fuad and Joseph S. Vandiver (eds.)
1970 Urban Sociology: Contemporary Readings, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

Ball, Donald W.
1972 "The Family as a Sociological Problem: Consideration of the Taken-for-Granted as a Prologue to Social Problems Analysis," Social Problems 19: 295-307.

Banfield, E. C.
1958 The Moral Basis of a Backward Society, New York: Free Press.

Barth, Ernest A. T. and Walter B. Watson
1965 "Stratification Theory, The Working Wife, and Family Life-Style," Paper read at the Annual Meeting of The Pacific Sociological Association, Salt Lake City, Utah, April 22-24, 1965.
1967 "Social Stratification and the Family in Mass Society," in Social Forces 45: 392-402.

Bascom, William R.
1970 "Urbanization Among the Yoruba," Reprinted in Fuad Baali and Joseph S. Vandiver (eds.) Urban Sociology: Contemporary Readings, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

Becker, Howard and Reuben Hill (eds.)
1955 Family, Marriage and Parenthood, 2nd edition, Boston: D. C. Heath and Co.

Bell, Colin
1969 Middle Class Families, London: Routeldge and Kegan Paul.

Bell, Colin and Howard Newby
1971 Community Studies: An Introduction to the Sociology of the Local Community, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.

Bell, W. and M. D. Boat
1957 "Urban Neighborhoods and Informal Social Relations," American Journal of Sociology 62: 390-398.

Bendix, Reinhard
1962 Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait, New York: Doubleday.

Bendix, Reinhard and Bennett Berger
1959 "Images of Society and Problems of Concept Formation in Sociology," in Llewellyn Gross (ed.) Symposium on Sociological Theory, Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company

Bennis, Warren G. and Philip Slater
1968 The Temporary Society, New York: Harper and Row.

Bergmann, Gustav
1957 Philosophy of Science, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Berkner, Lutz K.
1973 "The Stem Family and the Developmental Cycle of the Peasant Household: An 18th Century Austrian Example," in Michael Gordon (ed.) The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective, New York: St. Martin's Press.

Bernard, Jessie
1973 The Sociology of Community, Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Berry, Brian J. L.
1973 "Review Symposium: A Nation of Strangers by Vance Packard," American Journal of Sociology 79: 173-175.

Black, Max (ed.)
1961 The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Blau, Zena Smith
1961 "Structural Constraints on Friendship in Old Age," American Sociological Review 26: 429-439.

Blood, Robert O., Jr.
1968 "Impact of Urbanization on American Family Structure and Functioning," in Robert F. Winch and Louis Wolf Goodman (eds.) Selected Studies in Marriage and The Family, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Blumberg, Rae Lesser and Robert F. Winch
1972 "Societal Complexity and Familial Complexity: Evidence for the Curvilinear Hypothesis," American Journal of Sociology March 77: 5. 898-920.

Boskoff, Alvin
1949 "Structure, Function and Folk Society," American Sociological Review XIV: 749-58.
1969 Theory in American Sociology: Major Sources and Applications, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
1972 The Mosaic of Sociological Theory, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Bott, Elizabeth
1957 Family and Social Network, London: Tavistock Publications Limited.

Bottomore, T. B. (ed.)
1963 Karl Marx: Early Writings, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bottomore, T. B. and Maximilien Rubel (eds.)
1956 Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Psychology, London: C.A. Watts and Company Limited.

Bouglé, Célestin
1965 "The Sociology of Georg Simmel," La Philosophie Allemande au XIX Siecle, Paris: Felix Alcan, 1912. Reprinted in Louis A. Coser, Georg Simmel, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Bracey, John H., August Meier and Elliott Rudwick (eds.)
1970 The Black Sociologists: The First Half Century, Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Braude, Lee
1970 "'Park and Burgess': An Appreciation," American Journal of Sociology 76: 1-10.

Breese, Gerald
1966 Urbanization in Newly Developing Countries, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Breton, Raymond
1964 "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants," American Journal of Sociology 70: 193-205.

Brinton, Crane
1959 A History of Western Morals, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Brody, Eugene B.
1969 Behavior in New Environments: Adaptation of Migrant Populations, Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Bruner, Edward M.
1966 "Medan: The Role of Kinship in an Indonesian City," in Bernard Farber (ed.) Kinship and Family Organization, New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Burch, Thomas K.
1967 "The Size and Structure of Families: A Comparative Analysis of Census Data," American Sociological Review 32: 347-364.

Burgess, Ernest W.
1925 "The Growth of the City: An Introduction to a Research Project," in Robert E. Park et al., (eds.) The City, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
1926 The Urban Community, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1929 "The Family and the Person," in E.W. Burgess (ed.) Personality and the Social Group, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1948 "The Family in a Changing Society," American Journal of Sociology 54 (Sept.): 118-125. Reprinted in Paul Hatt and Albert Reiss (ed.) Cities and Society, op. cit., pp. 482-489.

Burgess, Ernest W. and Donald J. Bogue (eds.)
1964 Urban Sociology, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burgess, Ernest W. and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr.
1939 Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage, New York: Prentice-Hall.

Burgess, Ernest W. and Harvey J. Locke
1945 The Family: From Institution to Companionship, New York: American Book Company.

Burr, Wesley R.
1973 Theory Construction and The Sociology of the Family, New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Bynder, Herbert
1969 "Emile Durkheim and the Sociology of the Family," Journal of Marriage and The Family 31 (August): 527-533.

Callahan, Daniel (ed.)
1966 The Secular City Debate, New York: MacMillan.

Callow, Alexander B. Jr. (ed.)
1969 American Urban History: An Interpretive Reader with Commentaries, New York: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, D. T.
1964 "Distinguishing Differences of Perception from Failures of Communication in Cross-Cultural Studies," in F.S.C. Northrop and Helen Livingston (eds.) Cross-Cultural Understanding: Epistemology in Anthropology, New York: Harper Row.

Campbell, D. T.
1970 "Techniques for Determining Cultural Biases in Comparative Research," in Amitai Etzioni and Frederic L. Dubow (eds.) *Comparative Perspectives: Theories and Methods*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Cavan, Ruth Shonle
1965 *Suicide*, New York: Russell and Russell.

Chamberlin, Roy B. and Herman Feldman
1950 *The Dartmouth Bible*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Chambliss, Rollin
1954 *Social Thought from Hammurabi to Comte*, New York: Henry Holt, and Company.

Christensen, Harold T.
1964 "Development of the Family Field of Study," in H.T. Christensen (ed.) *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*, Chicago: Rand McNally and Co.

Clignet, R.
1965-66 "Urbanization and Family Structure in the Ivory Coast," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 8: 386-401.

Cohen, Morris R.
1959 *Reason and Nature: Essays on the Meaning of Scientific Method*, 2nd Edition, Glencoe: Free Press.

Cohen, Percy S.
1968 *Modern Social Theory*, New York: Basic Books.

Constantine, Larry L. and Joan M. Constantine
1972 *Group Marriage*, New York: Macmillan.

Cooley, Charles Horton
1964 *Human Nature and the Social Order*, New York: Schoken Books.

Coser, Lewis (ed.)
1965 *Georg Simmel*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
1971 *Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Cox, Harvey
1965 *The Secular City*, Toronto: MacMillan.

Craven, Paul and Barry Wellman
1973 "The Network City," in *Sociological Inquiry* 43: 57-88.

Crouch, Ben M.
1972 "Age and Institutional Support Perceptions of Older Mexican Americans," *Journal of Gerontology* 27: 524-529.

Cumming, Elaine and David M. Schneider
1961 "Sibling Solidarity: A Property of American Kinship," American Anthropologist, LXIII: 498-507.

Davis, Kingsley
1949 Human Society, New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, Richard
1960 "The Rural-Urban Continuum: Real but Relatively Unimportant," American Journal of Sociology 66: 60-66.

Dore, R. P.
1958 City Life in Japan, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Dubos, Rene
1961 The Dreams of Reason: Science and Utopias, New York: Columbia University Press.

Durkheim, Emile
1887 "A Review of Ferdinand Tönnies' Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft," Abhandlung Des Communismus and Des Socialismus als Empirischer Culturformen Leipzig. Reprinted in American Journal of Sociology 77: 1193-1199.
1951 Suicide, New York: Free Press.
1964 The Division of Labor in Society, New York: Free Press.
1965 "Sociology and Its Scientific Field," in Kurt H. Wolff (ed.) Emile Durkheim, 1859-1917: A Collection of Essays, with Translations and a Bibliography, Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1960. Reprinted in Louis A. Coser (ed.) Georg Simmel, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
1972 "A Review of Ferdinand Tönnies' Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft," reprinted in American Journal of Sociology 77: 1193-1199.

Effrat, Marcia Pelly
1973 "Approaches to Community: Conflicts and Complementarities," Sociological Inquiry 43: 1-32.

Elkin, Frederick
1968 The Family in Canada, Ottawa: The Vanier Institute of the Family.

Epstein, A. L.
1967 "Urbanization and Social Change in Africa," Current Anthropology 8: 275-296.
1969a "The Network and Urban Social Organization," in J. Clyde Mitchell (ed.) Social Networks in Urban Situations, Manchester: Manchester University Press 77-116.
1969b "Gossip, Norms and Social Network," in J. Clyde Mitchell (ed.) Social Networks in Urban Situations, Manchester: Manchester University Press 117-127.

Etzkorn, K. Peter

1968 *Georg Simmel: The Conflict in Modern Culture and Other Essays* (Trans.) New York: Teachers College Press.

Farber, Bernard

1964 *Family: Organization and Interaction*, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

1973a *Family and Kinship in Modern Society*, Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

1973b "Family and Community Structure: Salem in 1800," in Michael Gordon (ed.) *The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective*, New York: St. Martin's Press.

Faris, Robert E. L.

1964 *Handbook of Modern Sociology*, Chicago: Rand McNally and Co.

1967 *Chicago Sociology 1920-1932*, San Francisco: Chandler.

Faris, Robert E. L. and H. Warren Dunham

1960 *Mental Disorders in Urban Areas: An Ecological Study of Schizophrenia and Other Psychoses*, New York: Hafner.

Fava, Sylvia Fleis

1968 *Urbanism in World Perspective: A Reader*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Feagin, Joe R.

1973 "Community Disorganization: Some Critical Notes," in *Sociological Inquiry* 43: 123-146.

Ferrarotti, Franco

1973 "Bourgeois Sociology and the Family," in *Social Praxis* 1: 153-158.

Firey, Walter

1945 "Sentiment and Symbolism as Ecological Variables," *American Sociological Review* 10: 145-148.

1947 *Land Use in Central Boston*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Firth, Raymond (ed.)

1956 *Two Studies of Kinship in London*, London: University of London, Athlone Press.

Firth, Raymond, Jane Herbert and Anthony Forge

1970 *Families and Their Relatives: Kinship in a Middle Class Sector of London*, New York: Humanities Press.

Fischer, Claude S.

1972 "Urbanism as a Way of Life: A Review and an Agenda," in *Sociological Methods and Research* 1: 187-242.

Fischer, Claude S.
1973a "On Urban Alienations and Anomie: Powerlessness and Social Isolation," American Sociological Review 38: 311-326.
1973b "Review Symposium: A Nation of Strangers by Vance Packard," American Journal of Sociology 79: 168-173.

Fletcher, Ronald
1970 "The Making of the Modern Family," in Katherine Elliott (ed.) The Family and Its Future, London: J. and A. Churchill.
1971 The Making of Sociology: A Study of Sociological Theory, London: Nelson.

Form, William
1954 "The Place of Social Structure in the Determination of Land Use: Some Implications for a Theory of Urban Ecology," Social Forces 32: 317-323.

Foster, George M.
1967 Tzintzuntzan: Mexican Peasants in a Changing World, Boston: Little Brown and Company

Franklin, Frazier E.
1937 "The Impact of Urban Civilization Upon Negro Family Life," American Sociological Review 2: (October), 609-618. Reprinted in Paul Hatt and Albert Reiss (eds.) Cities and Society, op. cit., pp. 482-489.
1948 The Negro Family in the United States, Revised and Abridged Edition, New York: Citadel.

Freedman, Maurice (ed.)
1970 Family and Kinship in Chinese Society, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Frey, Frederick W., Peter Stephenson and Katherine Archer Smith (eds.)
1969 Survey Research on Comparative Social Change: A Bibliography, Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Furstenberg, Frank Jr.
1966 "Industrialization and the American Family: A Look Backward," American Sociological Review 31: 326-337,

Fustel de Coulanges, Numa Demis
N.D. The Ancient City: A Study on the Religion, Laws and Institutions of Greece and Rome, Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Gans, Herbert
1962a The Urban Villagers, New York: Free Press.
1962b "Urbanism and Suburbanism as Ways of Life: A Re-Evaluation of Definitions," in Arnold Rose (ed.) Human Behavior and Social Processes, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
1967 The Levittowners, New York: Pantheon.

Garigue, Philippe
1956 "French-Canadian Kinship and Urban Life," in American Anthropologist 58: 1090-1101.

Gibson, Geoffrey
1972 "Kin Family Network: Overheralded Structure in Past Conceptualizations of Family Functioning," Journal of Marriage and Family, February.

Goode, William J.
1963 World Revolution and Family Patterns, New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
1964 The Family, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Goode, William J., Elizabeth Hopkins and Helen M. McClure
1971 Social Systems and Family Patterns: A Propositional Inventory, New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Gordon, Michael (ed.)
1972 The Nuclear Family in Crisis: The Search for an Alternative, New York: Harper Row.
1973 The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective, New York: St. Martin's Press.

Gould, Julius
1966 Penguin Survey of the Social Sciences, 1965, London: Penguin.

Granovetter, Mark
1972 "The Strength of Weak Ties," American Journal of Sociology 78: 1360-1380.

Greenfield, Sidney
1961 "Industrialization and the Family in Sociological Theory," American Journal of Sociology 67: 312-322.

Greer, Scott
1956 "Urbanism Reconsidered," American Sociological Review XXII: 19-25.
1962 The Emerging City, New York: Free Press.
1969 The Logic of Social Inquiry, Chicago: Aldine.

Greer, Scott and Ella Kube
1959 "Urbanism and Social Structure: A Los Angeles Study," in Community Structure and Analysis, in Marvin B. Sussman (ed.) New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Greven, Philip J. Jr.
1973 "Family Structure in Seventeenth-Century Andover, Massachusetts," in The American Family in Social Historical Perspective, Michael Gordon (ed.), New York: St. Martin's Press.

Groves, Ernest R.
1927 Social Problems of the Family, Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company.
1933 Marriage, New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Groves, Ernest R. and Gladys H. Groves
1947 The Contemporary American Family, Revised edition, Chicago: J.B. Lippincott.

Groves, Ernest R. and W. F. Ogburn
1928 American Marriage and Family Relationships, New York: Henry Holt and Company

Groves, Ernest R., E. L. Skinner and S. Swenson
1932 The Family and Its Relationships, Chicago: J.B. Lippincott.

Guterman, Stanley S.
1969 "In Defense of Wirth's 'Urbanism as a Way of Life,'" American Journal of Sociology 74: 492-499.

Halpern, Joel Martin
1958 A Serbian Village, New York: Columbia University Press.

Handlin, Oscar and John Burchard
1963 The Historian and the City, Boston: M.I.T. and Boston University Press.

Hartley, E.
1967 "Attitudinal Research and the Jangle Fallacy," in M. Sherif and C.W. Sherif (eds.) Attitude, Ego Involvement and Change, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Hatt, Paul K. and Albert J. Reiss, Jr.
1957 Cities and Society: The Revised Reader in Urban Sociology, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Hauser, Philip M.
1965a "Urbanization: An Overview," in The Study of Urbanization, Philip M. Hauser and Leo F. Schnore (eds.) New York: Wiley.
1965b "Observations on the Urban-Folk and Urban-Rural Dichotomies as Forms of Western Ethnocentrism," in The Study of Urbanization, Philip M. Hauser and Leo F. Schnore (eds.) New York: Wiley.

Hauser, Philip M. and Leo Schnore (eds.)
1965 The Study of Urbanization, New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Hawley, Amos
1973 "Review Symposium: A Nation of Strangers by Vance Packard," American Journal of Sociology 79: 165-168.

Hayner, Norman
1945 "Mexico City: Its Growth and Configuration," American Journal of Sociology 50: 295-304.

Heberle, Rudolf
1948a "The Sociological System of Ferdinand Tönnies: Community and Society," in Harry Elmer Barnes (ed.) An Introduction to the History of Sociology, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1948b "The Sociology of Georg Simmel," in Harry Elmer Barnes (ed.) An Introduction to the History of Sociology, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hill, Reuben
1962 "Cross-National Family Research: Attempts and Prospects," International Social Science Journal 14: 425-451.
1966 "Contemporary Developments in Family Theory," Journal of Marriage and the Family, February: 10-26.

Hillery, George A. Jr.
1963 "Villages, Cities and Total Institutions," American Sociological Review 28: 779-791.

Hobart, Charles W.
1963 "Commitment, Value Conflict and the Future of the American Family," Marriage and Family Living 25: (November) 405-412.

Horton, John
1966 "Order and Conflict Theories of Social Problems as Competing Ideologies," American Journal of Sociology 71: 701-713.

Hoselitz, Bert F. and Wilbert E. Moore
1966 Industrialization and Society, The Hague: UNESCO-Mouton.

Hughes, Everett C.
1952 "Preface" to Human Communities: The City and Human Ecology, by Robert E. Park, Glencoe: Free Press
1954-55 "Robert E. Park's Views on Urban Society: A Comment on William L. Kolb's Paper," Economic Development and Cultural Change 3: 47-49.
1955 "Foreward," in Georg Simmel's Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliations, New York: Free Press.

Irish, Donald P.
1966 "Sibling Interaction: A Neglected Aspect in Family Life Research," in Bernard Farber (ed.) Kinship and Family Organization, New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Irving, Howard
1972 The Family Myth, Toronto: Copp Clark

Israel, Joachin
1971 Alienation from Marx to Modern Sociology, Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Jacobs, Jane
1961 The Death and Life of Great American Cities, New York: Vantage Books.

Janowitz, Morris
1969 "Introduction" to Introduction to the Science of Sociology, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 3rd Edition, Revised.

Jennings, Eugene E.
1970 "Mobicentric Man," Psychology Today, 4 (July).

Johnson, Erwin H.
1960 "The Stem Family and its Extensions in Modern Japan," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1960, quoted in Sidney M. Greenfield, *op. cit.*, pp. 411-412.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss
1968 "Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities," American Sociological Review 33: 499-517.
1970 "Commun~~es,~~" Psychology Today 4: 53-58.
1973 "Utopian Communities," in Sociological Inquiry 43: 263-290.

Kaplan, Abraham
1964 The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology For Behavioral Science, San Francisco: Chandler.

Keller, Suzanne
1968 The Urban Neighborhood, New York: Random House.

Key, William H.
1961 "Rural-Urban Differences and the Family," Sociological Quarterly 2: 49-56.

Koestler, Arthur
1959 The Sleepwalkers: A History of Man's Changing Vision of the Universe, New York: Macmillan.
1969 The Act of Creation, London: Hutchinson and Company.
1970 The Ghost in the Machine, London: Pan Books Limited.

Kolb, William L.
1954-55 "The Social Structure and Functions of Cities," Economic Development and Cultural Change 3: 30-46.

Komarovsky, Mirra
1955 "Functional Analysis of Sex Roles," reprinted in Marvin B. Sussman (ed.) Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin.

Komarovsky, Mirra and W. Waller
1945 "Studies of the Family," American Journal of Sociology 50: 443-451.

Kumar, Krishna
1973 "Some Reflections on Individual Modernity," Comparative Events 4 (Fall): 1-9.

Lantz, Herman R., Raymond L. Schmitt and Richard Herman
1973 "The Preindustrial Family in America: A Further Examination of Early Magazines," American Journal of Sociology 79: 566-588.

Laslett, Peter
1973 "The Comparative History of Household and Family," in Michael Gordon (ed.) The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective, New York: St. Martin's Press.

Leslie, Gerald R.
1967 The Family in Social Context, New York: Oxford University Press.

Levine, Donald N.
1965 "Some Key Problems in Simmel's Work," in Louis A. Coser (ed.) Georg Simmel, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Levy, M. J. Jr.
1966 Modernization and the Structure of Societies, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Levy, Marion J. and Lloyd Fallers
1968 "The Family: Some Comparative Consideration," in M.B. Sussman (ed.) Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Lewis, Oscar
1952 "Urbanization Without Breakdown: A Case Study," in The Scientific Monthly 75: (July).
1960 Tepoztlan: Village in Mexico, New York: Henry Holt and Company.
1963 Life in a Mexican Village: Tepoztlan Restudied, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
1965 "Further Observations on the Folk-Urban Continuum and Urbanization with Special Reference to Mexico City," in The Study of Urbanization, Philip M. Hauser and Leo F. Schnore, (eds.) New York: Wiley.

Lieberson, Stanley
1961 "A Societal Theory of Race and Ethnic Relations," American Sociological Review 26: 902-910.

Liebow, Elliot
1967 Tally's Corner, Boston: Little, Brown.

Linton, Ralph
1959 "The Natural History of the Family," in Ruth N. Anshen, The Family, Its Function and Destiny, New York: Harpers.

Litwak, Eugene
1959-60 "The Use of Extended Family Groups in the Achievement of Social Goals," Social Problems VII: 177-187.
1960a "Occupational Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion," American Sociological Review 25: 9-21.
1960b "Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion," American Sociological Review 25: 385-394.
1965 "Extended Kin Relations in an Industrial Democratic Society," in Ethel Shanas and Gordon F. Streib (eds.) Social Structure and the Family: Generational Relations, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
1968 "The Use of Extended Family Groups in Achievement of Social Goals," in M.B. Sussman (ed.) Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Litwak, Eugene and Ivan Szelenyi
1969 "Primary Group Structures and Their Functions: Kin, Neighbors and Friends," American Sociological Review 34: 465-

Loomis, Charles P. and J. Allan Beegle
1957 Rural Sociology: The Strategy of Change, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall

Loomis, Charles P. and Zona P. Loomis
1961 Modern Social Theories, Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. and Georg Boas
1935 Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Lowenthal, M. F. and C. Haven
1968 "Interaction and Adaptation: Intimacy as a Critical Variable," American Sociological Review 33: 20-30.

Lucas, Rex A.
1971 Minetown, Milltown, Railtown: Life in Canadian Communities of Single Industry, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Madge, John
1962 The Origins of Scientific Sociology, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Maine, Henry Sumner

1885 "On Status and Contract," reprinted from *Ancient Law* (New York: H. Holt and Co., 5th London edition) in Talcott Parsons et al., (eds.) *Theories of Society*, Vol. 1, New York: Free Press 1961, 138-139.

Mamelet, Alfred

1965 "Sociological Relativism," from A. Maelet, *Le Relativisme Philosophique Chez Georg Simmel* pp. 144-155. Reprinted in Louis A. Coser, Georg Simmel, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Mann, Peter H.

1965 *An Approach to Urban Sociology*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Mannhein, Karl

1936 *Ideology and Utopia*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Marriott, McKimm

1954-55 "Some Comments on William L. Kolb's 'The Structure and Functions of Cities' in the Light of India's Urbanization," *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 3: 50-52.

Marsh, Robert M.

1967 *Comparative Sociology: A Codification of Cross-Societal Analysis*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.

Marsh, Robert M. and Hiroshi Mannari

1971 "Lifetime Commitment in Japan: Roles, Norms, and Values," *American Journal of Sociology* 76: 795-812.

Martindale, Don

1959 "Sociological Theory and The Ideal Type," in Llewellyn Gross (ed.) *Symposium on Sociological Theory*, Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company.

1960 *The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

1964 "The Formation and Destruction of Communities," in George K. Zollschan and Walter Hirsch (eds.) *Explorations in Social Change*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 61-87.

Marx, Leo

1964 *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*, New York: Oxford, 1964.

Matza, David

1969 *Becoming Deviant*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

McKinney, John C.
1966 Constructive Typology and Social Theory, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts

McKinney, John C. and Edward A. Tiryakian
1970 Theoretical Sociology: Perspectives and Developments, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

McLaughlin, Virginia Yans
1973 "Patterns of Work and Family Organization: Buffalo's Italians," in Michael Gordon (ed.) The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective, New York: St. Martin's Press.

Merton, Robert K.
1938 "Social Structure and Anomie," American Sociological Review 3: 672-82.
1957 Social Theory and Social Structure, revised edition, Glencoe: The Free Press.

Merton, Robert K., Leonard Broom and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (eds.)
1959 Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects, New York: Basic Books.

Metzger, L. Paul
1971 "American Sociology and Black Assimilation: Conflicting Perspectives," American Journal of Sociology 76: 627-647.

Michelson, William H.
1970 Man and his Urban Environment: A Sociological Approach, Toronto: Addison-Wesley, 1970.
1973 "The Reconciliation of 'Subjective' and 'Objective' Data on Physical Environment in the Community: The Case of Social Contact in High-Rise Apartments," Sociological Inquiry 43: 147-173.

Milgram, Stanley
1967 "The Small-World Problem," Psycholoday Today 1: (May), 62-67.

Mills, C. Wright
1971 "The Professional Ideology of Social Pathologists," reprinted in Edward A. Tiryakian (ed.) The Phenomenon of Sociology: A Reader in the Sociology of Sociology, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, pp. 219-235.

Minar, David W. and Scott Greer
1969 The Concept of Community, Chicago: Aldine.

Miner, Horace
1953 The Primitive City of Timbuctoo, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mintz, Sidney
1953 "The Folk-Urban Continuum and the Rural Proletarian Community," *American Journal of Sociology* LIX: 136-43.

Mitchell, H. Clyde
1969 "The Concept and Use of Social Networks," in J. Clyde Mitchell (ed.) *Social Networks in Urban Situations: Analyses of Personal Relationships in Central African Towns*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 1-50.

Mogey, John
1966 "Contemporary Developments in Family Theory: A Discussion," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* February: 26-28.

Moore, Wilbert E.
1963 *Social Change*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Morris, R. N.
1968 *Urban Sociology*, New York: Frederick A. Praeger.

Mowrer, Ernest R.
1927 *Family Disorganization*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Newman, William M.
1973 *American Pluralism: A Study of Minority Groups and Social Theory*, New York: Harper and Row.

Nimkoff, M. F. and Russell Middleton
1960 "Types of Family and Types of Economy," *American Journal of Sociology* 31: 302-10.

Nisbet, Robert A.
1953 *The Quest for Community*, New York: Oxford University Press.
1966 *The Sociological Tradition*, New York: Basic Books.
1969 *Social Change and History: Aspects of the Western Theory of Development*, London: Oxford University Press.
1970 "Developmentalism: A Critical Analysis," in John C. McKinney and Edward A. Tiryakian, *Theoretical Sociology Perspectives and Development*, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.
1973 *The Social Philosophers: Community and Conflict in Western Thought*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Northrop, F. S. C. and Helen Livingston
1964 *Cross-Cultural Understanding: Epistemology in Anthropology*, New York: Harper Row.

Nye, F. Ivan and Felix M. Berardo
1966 *Emerging Conceptual Frameworks in Family Analysis*, New York: Macmillan.

Ogburn, William F.
1922 Social Change: With Respect to Culture and Original Nature, New York: Viking.
1929 "The Decline of the American Family," New York Times Magazine February 17, 1929. Reprinted in Sorokin, Zimmerman and Galprin, op. cit., Volume 2: 119-123.
1964 On Culture and Social Change: Selected Papers, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ogburn, William F. with C. Tibbitts
1933 "The Family and Its Functions," in President's Research Committee on Social Trends, Recent Social Trends in the United States, Vol. 1, 661-708, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ossowski, Stanislaw
1963 Class Structure in the Social Consciousness, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Osterreich, Helgi
1971 "Geographical Mobility and Kinship: A Canadian Example," in K. Ishwaran (ed.) The Canadian Family, Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Limited.

Otto, Herbert A. (ed.)
1970 The Family in Search of a Future, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

Owen, John E.
1961 "The Community," in Readings in Contemporary American Sociology, Joseph S. Roucek (ed.) Paterson, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams and Company.

Park, Robert E.
1950 Race and Culture: Essays in the Sociology of Contemporary Man, Glencoe: The Free Press.
1952 Human Communities: The City and Human Ecology, Glencoe: Free Press.
1967 On Social Control and Collective Behavior, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1973 "Life History," in American Journal of Sociology 29: 251-60.

Park, Robert E. and Ernest W. Burgess
1969 Introduction to the Science of Sociology, 3rd edition, revised, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Park, Robert E., Ernest W. Burgess and Roderick D. McKenzie
1925 The City, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Parsons, Talcott
1937 The Structure of Social Action, New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Parsons, Talcott

1942 "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States," American Sociological Review 7 (October) reprinted in Talcott Parsons (ed.) Essays in Sociological Theory, revised edition, New York: Free Press, 1954.

1943 "The Kinship System of the Contemporary United States," American Anthropologist 45: 22-38, reprinted in Talcott Parsons (ed.) Essays in Sociological Theory, revised edition, New York: Free Press, 1954.

1953 "Some Comments on the State of the General Theory of Action," American Sociological Review 18.

1965 "The Normal American Family," in S.M. Farber, P. Mustacchi, and R.H.L. Wilson (eds.) Man and Civilization: The Family's Search for Survival, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Parsons, Talcott and Robert Bales

1955 Family Socialization and Interaction Process, Glencoe: The Free Press.

Parsons, Talcott and Edward Shils (eds.)

1954 Toward a General Theory of Action, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Parsons, Talcott, Edward Shils, Kasper Naegle and Jesse R. Pitts (eds.) Theories of Society, Vol. I and II, New York: Free Press.

Parsons, Talcott and Neil O. Smelser

1956 Economy and Society, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Paul, Gurbachan Singh

1973 "Limitations of Weber's Comparative Methodology and Recent Economic Development Theory," unpublished manuscript, Department of Sociology, The University of Alberta.

Pease, John, William H. Form and Joan H. Rytina

1970 "Ideological Currents in American Stratification Literature," American Sociologist 5: 127-137.

Petersen, Karen Kay

1968 "Demographic Conditions and Extended Family Household: Egyptian Data," Social Forces 46 (June): 531-37.

1969 "Kin Network Research: A Plea for Comparability," Journal of Marriage and the Family 31 (May): 271-80.

1971 "Villagers in Cairo: hypotheses versus data," American Journal of Sociology 77 (November): 560-73.

Pitt-Rivers, Julien

1968 "Pseudo-Kinship," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 8: 408-413, New York: Macmillan and The Free Press.

Pleck, Elizabeth H.
1973 "The Two-Parent Household: Black Family Structure in Late Nineteenth-Century Boston," in Michael Gordon (ed.) The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective, New York: St. Martin's Press.

Polanyi, Michael
1964 Science, Faith and Society, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pope, Whitney
1973 "Classic on Classic: Parsons' Interpretation of Durkheim," American Sociological Review 38: 399-415.

Poplin, Dennis E.
1972 Communities: A Survey of Theories and Methods of Research, New York: Macmillan.

Queen, Stuart A. and Robert W. Habenstein
1967 The Family in Various Cultures, 3rd edition, New York: J.B. Lippincott Company.

Radin, Paul
1933 The Method and Theory of Ethnology, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rainwater, Lee
1968 "The Problem of Lower-Class Culture and Poverty-War Strategy," in Daniel P. Moynihan (ed.) On Understanding Poverty, New York: Basic Books.

Reckless, Walter C.
1969 Vice in Chicago, Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith.

Redfield, Margaret Park (ed.)
1962 Human Nature and the Study of Society: The Papers of Robert Redfield, Vol. 1, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Redfield, Robert
1930 Tepoztlan, A Mexican Village, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1934 "Culture Change in Yucatan," American Anthropologist 36: 57-69. Reprinted in Human Nature and the Study of Society, M.P. Redfield (ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962: 160-172.
1941 The Folk Culture of Yucatan, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1947 "The Folk Society," in American Journal of Sociology LII Reprinted in Human Nature and the Study of Society, M.P. Redfield (ed.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
1950 A Village that Chose Progress: Chan Kom Revisited, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Redfield, Robert
1955 The Little Community: Viewpoints for the Study of a Human Whole, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Redfield, Robert and Alfonso Villa Rojas
1934 Chan Kom: A Maya Village, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Redfield, Robert and Milton B. Singer
1954-55 "The Cultural Role of Cities," Economic Development and Cultural Change 3: 53-73.

Reiss, Paul J.
1965 "Extended Kinship Relationships in American Society," in Hyman Rodman (ed.) Marriage, Family and Society, New York: Random House.

Reissman, Leonard
1964 The Urban Process, New York: Free Press.

Riemer, Svend
1959 "Urban Personality Reconsidered," in Marvin B. Sussman (ed.) Community Structure and Analysis, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Robins, Lee N. and Miroda Tomanec
1966 "Closeness to Blood Relatives Outside the Immediate Family," in Bernard Farber (ed.) Kinship and Family Organization, New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Rodman, Hyman
1965a "Middle-Class Misconceptions about Lower-Class Families," in Hyman Rodman (ed.) Marriage, Family and Society, New York: Random House.
1965b "Talcott Parsons' View of the Changing American Family," in Hyman Rodman (ed.) Marriage, Family and Society, New York: Random House.

Rogers, Rolf E.
1969 Max Weber's Ideal Type Theory, New York: Philosophical Library.

Rose, Arnold M.
"The Relation of Theory and Method," in L. Gross (ed.) Sociological Theory: Inquiries and Paradigms.

Rosen, Bernard C.
1973 "Social Change, Migration and Family Interaction in Brazil," American Sociological Review 38: 198-212.

Rosow, Irving
1967 Social Integration of the Aged, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Roucek, Joseph (ed.)
1961 Readings in Contemporary American Sociology, Paterson, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams and Company.

Schneider, David M. and George C. Homans
1965 "Uncle and Aunt: A Problem in Kinship Terminology," in Hyman Rodman (ed.) Marriage, Family and Society, New York: Random House.

Schnore, Leo F. (ed.)
1968 Social Science and the City, New York: Frederick A. Praeger.

Schorr, Alvin L.
1965 "Filial Responsibility and the Aging," in Hyman Rodman (ed.) Marriage, Family and Society, New York: Random House.

Sennett, Richard (ed.)
1969 Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.
1970 The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity and City Life, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Shannon, Lyle and Magdaline Shannon
1968 "The Assimilation of Migrants to Cities," in Leo Schnore (ed.) Social Science and the City: A Survey of Urban Research, New York: Praeger.

Shils, Edward
1948 The Present State of American Sociology, Glencoe: Free Press.

Shlien, John M.
1965 "Mother-in-law: A Problem in Kinship Terminology," in Hyman Rodman (ed.) Marriage, Family and Society, New York: Random House.

Short, James F. Jr. (ed.)
1971 The Social Fabric of the Metropolis: Contributions of the Chicago School of Urban Sociology, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shulman, N.
1971 "Social Networks in an Urban Setting: An Examination of the Formation and Functions of Network Relationships," Paper presented at Canadian Sociological and Anthropological Association meetings, Saint John's, June.

Simmel Georg

1898a "The Persistence of Social Groups," *American Journal of Sociology* 3: 662-698.

1898b "The Persistence of Social Groups," (cont.) *American Journal of Sociology* 3: 829-836.

1898-99 "The Persistence of Social Groups," (cont.) *American Journal* of Sociology 4: 35-50.

1902-3 "The Number of Members as Determining the Sociological Form of the Group," *American Journal of Sociology* viii: 1-46.

1905 "A Contribution to the Sociology of Religion," *American Journal of Sociology* XI: 359-76.

1906 "The Sociology of Secrecy and of the Secret Society," *American Journal of Sociology* XI: 441-98.

1909 "The Problem of Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology* XV: 289-320.

1910 "How is Society Possible?" *American Journal of Sociology* XVI: 372-91.

1955 *Conflict and The Web of Group-Affiliations*, New York: Free Press.

1964 "The Metropolis and Mental Life," in *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, ed. by K.H. Wolff, Glencoe: The Free Press.

1969a "The Sociological Significance of the Stranger," in Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology,* 3rd edition, revised, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 322-331.

1969b "Social Interaction as the Definition of the Group in Time and Space," in Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 3rd edition, revised, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 348-356.

1969c "Sociology of the Senses: Visual Interaction," in Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 3rd edition, revised, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 356-361.

1969d "Money and Freedom," in Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 3rd edition, revised, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 553-554.

1969e "Conflict as a Type of Social Interaction," in Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introdution to the Science of Sociology*, 3rd edition, revised, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 582-586.

1969f "Types of Conflict Situations," in Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 3rd edition, revised, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 586-594.

1969g "The Reciprocal Character of Subordination and Superordination," in Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 3rd edition, revised, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 695-697.

1969h "Three Types of Subordination and Superordination," in Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 3rd edition, revised, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 697-703.

1969i "War and Peace as Types of Conflict and Accommodation," in Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, Introduction to the Science of Sociology, 3rd edition, revised, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 703-706.

1969j "Compromise and Accommodation," in Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, Introduction to the Science of Sociology, 3rd edition, revised, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 706-708.

Simon, Julian L.

1969 Basic Research Methods in Social Science: The Art of Empirical Investigation, New York: Random House.

Sjoberg, Gideon

1952 "Folk and Feudal Societies," American Journal of Sociology LVIII (November): 231-39.

1959 "Comparative Urban Sociology," in Robert K. Merton et al. (eds.) Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects, New York: Basic Books, Inc., pp. 334-359.

1960 The Preindustrial City: Past and Present, New York: Free Press.

1964 "The Rural-Urban Dimension in Preindustrial, Transitional, and Industrial Societies," in Robert E.L. Farris (ed.) Handbook of Modern Sociology, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, pp. 127-159.

1965a "Theory and Research in Urban Sociology," in The Study of Urbanization, Philip M. Hauser and Leo F. Schnore (eds.), New York: Wiley.

1965b "Cities in Historical Perspective," in The Study of Urbanization, Philip M. Hauser and Leo F. Schnore (eds.) New York: Wiley.

1970 "The Comparative Method in the Social Sciences," in Amitai Etzioni and Frederic L. Dubold (eds.) Comparative Perspectives: Theories and Methods, Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Skolnick, Arlene

1971 "Families Can Be Unhealthy for Children and Other Living Things," Psychology Today (August).

Skolnick, Arlene S. and Jerome H. Skolnick (eds.)

1971 Family in Transition, Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Smelser, Neil

1965 The Sociology of Economic Life, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Smith, Joel, W. H. Form and G. P. Stone

1954 "Local Intimacy in a Middle-Sized City," American Journal of Sociology 60: 276-284.

Smith, T. Lynn
1940 The Sociology of Rural Life, New York: Harper and Brothers.

Sorokin, Pitirm
1928 Contemporary Sociological Theories, New York: Harper and Brothers.
1937 Social and Cultural Dynamics: Fluctuation of Social Relationships, War and Revolution, New York: American Book Company.
1957 Social and Cultural Dynamics, Boston: Porter Sargent.

Sorokin, Pitirim, and Carle C. Zimmerman
1929 Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology, New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Sorokin, Pitirm A., Carle C. Zimmerman and Charles J. Galpin
1965 A Systematic Sourcebook in Rural Sociology, New York: Russell and Russell, Vols. 1-3.

Spykman, Nicholas J.
1964 The Social Theory of Georg Simmel, New York: Russell and Russell.

Staples, Robert
1971 "Towards a Sociology of the Black Family: A Theoretical and Methodological Assessment," Journal of Marriage and the Family 33: 119-130.

Stein, Maurice R.
1960 The Eclipse of Community: An Interpretation of American Studies, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stephens, William N.
1963 The Family in Cross-Cultural Perspective, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Strauss, Anselm
1961 Images of the American City, New York: The Free Press.
1968a The American City: A Sourcebook of Urban Imagery, Chicago: Aldine.
1968b "Strategies for Discovering Urban Theory," Reprinted in Anselm L. Strauss (ed.) The American City: A Sourcebook of Urban Imagery, Chicago: Aldine, 1968: Originally appearing in Leo F. Schnore and Henry Fagin(eds.) Urban Research and Policy Planning, Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1967, pp. 91-98.

Sussman, Marvin B.
1953 "The Help Pattern in the Middle-Class Family," American Sociological Review 18: 22-28.

Sussman, Marvin B.

1954 "Family Continuity: Selective Factors Which Affect Relationships Between Families at Generational Levels," Marriage and Family Living XVI (May): 112-120.

1959a Community Structure and Analysis, New York: Crowell.

1959b "The Isolated Nuclear Family: Fact or Fiction?" Social Problems VI: 333-340.

1965 "Intergenerational Family Relationships and Family Theory," in Ethel Shanas and Gordon Streib (eds.) Social Structure and the Family: Generational Relations, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

1968 "Relationships of Adult Children with Their Parents in the United States," in M.B. Sussman (ed.) Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Sussman, Marvin B. and Lee G. Burchinal

1962 "Parental Aid to Married Children: Implications for Family Functioning," Marriage and Family Living 24: 320-332.

Sweetzer, Dorrian Apple

1968 "The Effect of Industrialization on Intergenerational Solidarity," in Robert F. Winch and Louis Wolf Goodman (eds.) Selected Studies in Marriage and the Family, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

1970 "The Structure of Sibling Relationships," American Journal of Sociology 76: 47-58.

Tabor, Eithne

1950 The Cliff's Edge: Songs of a Psychotic, New York: Sheed and Ward.

Tax, Sol

1939 "Culture and Civilization: Guatemalan Societies," Scientific Monthly 48 (May).

1941 "World View and Social Relations in Guatemala," American Anthropologist 43: 27-42.

Tenbruck, F. H.

1965 "Formal Sociology," in Kurt H. Wolff (ed.) Georg Simmel 1858-1918: A Collection of Essays with Translations and a Bibliography, Columbus, Ohio: State University Press, 1959. Reprinted in Louis A. Coser, Georg Simmel, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Thernstrom, Stephan

1970 "'Yankee City' Revisited: The Perils of Historical Naivete," in Michael Aiken and Paul E. Mott (eds.) The Structure of Community Power, New York: Random House.

Thomas. W. I.

1971 "The Immigrant Community," in The Social Fabric of the Metropolis: Contributions of the Chicago School of Urban Sociology, James F. Short (ed.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Reprinted from Old World Traits Transplanted, Robert E. Park and Herbert A. Miller (eds.) New York: Harper and Brothers, 1921.

Thrasher, Frederic

1927 The Gang: A Study of 1,313 Gangs in Chicago, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1963 The Gang: A Study of 1,313 Gangs in Chicago, abridged, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tilly, Charles

1968 "The Forms of Urbanization," in Talcott Parsons (ed.) American Sociology: Perspective, Problems, Methods, New York: Basic Books.

1970 "Clio and Minerva," in John C. McKinney and Edward A. Tiryakian, Theoretical Sociology: Perspectives and Developments, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

Tiryakian, Edward A.

1971 "A Problem for the Sociology of Knowledge: the Mutual Unawareness of Emile Durkheim and Max Weber," in Edward A. Tiryakian (ed.) The Phenomenon of Sociology: A Reader in the Sociology of Sociology, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 428-434.

Tobin, Sheldon and Bernice Neugarten

1961 "Life Satisfaction and Social Interaction in the Aging," Journal of Gerontology 16: 344-46.

Toffler, Alvin

1970 Future Shock, New York: Random House.

Tomeh, Aida

1964 "Informal Group Participation and Residential Patterns," American Journal of Sociology 70: 28-35.

1973 "Participation, Correlates and Interrelationships," Sociological Inquiry 43: 89-122.

Tönnies, Ferdinand

1893 "A Review of Emile Durkheim's 'De La Division Du Travail Social'," Archiv Fur Systematische Philosophie, Paris, Reprinted in American Journal of Sociology 77: 1199-1200, 1972.

1957 Community and Society (Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft) Charles P. Loomis (trans. and ed.) New York: Harper Row.

1965 "Simmel as Sociologist," originally published in Frankfurter Zeitung, October 9, 1918. Reprinted in Louis A. Coser (ed.) Georg Simmel, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Townsend, Peter
1963 *The Family Life of Older People*, Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Turner, Ralph H.
1967 "Introduction," to *On Social Control and Collective Behavior*, Robert E. Park, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vallier, Ivan (ed.)
1971 *Comparative Methods in Sociology: Essays on Trends and Applications*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Vatuk, Sylvia
1972 *Kinship and Urbanization: White Collar Migrants in North India*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Vidich, Arthur J. and Joseph Ben[illegible]man
1960 *Small Town in Mass Society: Class Power, and Religion in a Rural Community*, Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Vogel, Ezra F.
1967 "Kinship Structure, Migration to the City, and Modernization," in R.P. Dore, *Aspects of Social Change in Modern Japan*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
1968 "Family and Kinship," in Talcott Parsons (ed.) *American Sociology Perspectives, Problems, Methods*, New York: Basic Books, pp. 121-130.
1971 *Japan's New Middle Class*, 2nd edition, Berkeley: University of California Press.

von Wiese, Leopold
1965 "Simmel's Formal Method," in *Archiv fur Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* XXXI (1910: 897-901. Reprinted in Louis A. Coser (ed.) *Georg Simmel*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Wagner, Helmut
1963 "Types of Sociological Theory," *American Sociological Review* 28: 735-742.
1964 "Displacement of Scope: A Problem of the Relationship between Small-Scale and Large-Scale Sociological Theories," *American Journal of Sociology* 69: 571-584.

Wallace, Walter (ed.)
1969 *Sociological Theory: An Introduction*, Chicago: Aldine.

Warnecke, Richard B. and Richard A. Zeller
1973 "Testing Typological Hypotheses: An Analytic Example," in *Sociological Methods and Research* 7: 275-301.

Watson, Walter B. and Ernest A. T. Barth
1964 "Questionable Assumptions in the Theory of Social Stratification," in Pacific Sociological Review 7: 10-16.

Webb, Eugene J., Donald T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz and Lee Sechrest
1966 Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Weber, Max
1962 The City, D. Martindale and G. Neuwirth (transl.), New York: Collier Books.

Weigert, Andrew J. and Darwin L. Thomas
1971 "Family as a Conditional Universal," in Journal of Marriage and the Family, February: 188-194.

Wellman, Barry *et al*.
1971 "The Uses of Community: Community Ties and Support Systems," Research Paper N. 47, Toronto: Centre for Urban and Community Studies and Department of Sociology.

Wellman, Barry
1972 "Who Needs Neighbourhoods?" Manuscript to appear in Alan Powell (ed.) Urban Myths and Realities Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

Westie, Frank R.
1957 "Toward Closer Relations Between Theory and Research: A Procedure," American Sociological Review 22: 149-154

White, Morton and Lucia White
1964 The Intellectual Versus the City: From Thomas Jefferson to Frank Lloyd Wright, Toronto: Mentor Books.

Whyte, William Foote
1943 "Social Organization in the Slums," American Sociological Review 8: (February).
1955 Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Williams, Robin M.
1966 "Some Further Comments on Chronic Controversies," American Journal of Sociology 71: 717-721.

Winch, Robert F.
1968 "Some Observations on Extended Familism in the United States," In Selected Studies in Marriage and the Family, Robert F. Winch and Louis Wolf Goodman, 3rd edition, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Winch, Robert F.
1970 "Permanence and Change in the History of the American Family and Some Speculations on its Future," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 32: 6-15.

Winch, Robert F. and Rae Lesser Blumberg
1968 "Societal Complexity and Familial Organization," in *Selected Studies in Marriage and the Family*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 3rd edition.

Winch, Robert F. and Scott A. Greer
1968 "Urbanism, Ethnicity and Extended Familism," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 40-45.

Winch, Robert F., Scott A. Greer and Rae Lesser Blumberg
1967 "Ethnicity and Extended Familism in an Upper-Middle-Class Suburb," *American Sociological Review* XXXII.

Wirth, Louis
1925 "A Bibliography of the Urban Community," in Robert E. Park *et al*. (eds.) *The City*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1926 "The Sociology of Ferdinand Tönnies," *American Journal of Sociology* 32: 412-421.
1928 *The Ghetto*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1945 "The Problem of Minority Groups," in *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, edited by Ralph Linton, New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 347-72.
1957 "Urbanism as a Way of Life," in Paul L. Hatt and Albert J. Reiss (eds.) *Cities and Society: The Revised Reader in Urban Sociology*, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press; also in Richard Sennett (ed.) *Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities*, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1969: 143-164.
1969 "Rural-Urban Differences," in Richard Sennett (ed.) *Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities*, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 165-169. Originally printed in Albert J. Reiss, Jr. (ed.) *On Cities and Social Life*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Wolf, Eric R.
1964 *Anthropology*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Wolff, Kurt H. (trans. and ed.)
1950 *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, Glencoe: Free Press.
1960 *Emile Durkheim, 1858-1917: A Collection of Essays, with Translations and a Bibliography*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Young, Michael and Peter Willimott
1957 *Family and Kinship in East London*, Glencoe: The Free Press.

LEAF 265 OMITTED IN PAGE NUMBERING.

Zangwill, Israel
1921 The Melting Pot: Drama in Four Acts, New York: Macmillan.

Zeitlin, Irving M.
1968 Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Zimmer, Basil
1955 "Participation of Migrants in Urban Structure," American Sociological Review 20: 218-224.
1959 "The Singificance of Membership in Associations," American Journal of Sociology 65: 196-201.

Zimmerman, Carle C.
1947 Family and Civilization, New York: Harper and Brothers
1971 "The Atomistic Family - Fact or Fiction," in International Journal of Contemporary Sociology 8: 112-124.
1972 "The Future of the Family in America," in Journal of Marriage and the Family (May).

Zorbaugh, Harvey W.
1929 The Gold Coast and the Slum, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX A

PROBLEMS IN THE USE OF POLAR TYPE CONSTRUCTS

APPENDIX A

Problems in The Use of Polar Type Constructs

As discussed earlier, dualistic distinctions are part of a long history of philosophical-religious thought. Antithetical distinctions are also common in popular thought. Additionally, many of the major social thinkers from the mid-nineteenth century up until the present have made use of dichotomous constructs. Such constructs as Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft, Mechanical-Organic Solidarity, Institutional-Companionship, are well established in the general vocabulary of sociology. These dualistic distinctions have taken many forms; however, they have often been used to broadly characterize what has been for many writers basically a distinction between rural versus urban. In spite of (or perhaps, in part, because of) their popularity, such polar dichotomies present certain pitfalls. Some of these pitfalls were recognized by major theorists after they found themselves historically associated with particular polar types. Polar constructs are frequently used in examinations of modern social bonds, thus an explication of some of their problematic aspects seems necessary.

Redfield's folk-urban dichotomy is an example of one of the more commonly cited polar constructs. Probably the most detailed criticism of this dichotomy was made by Oscar Lewis (1951). It will be recalled that Lewis initially planned to do an elaboration on Redfield's 1930 study of Tepotzlan, Mexico. However, after finding sharp discrepancies between his observations and those previously made by Redfield, Lewis decided in favor of a re-study. Some of the discrepancies between the two sets of findings, Lewis attributes to Redfield's use of the folk-urban construct. Lewis' criticisms serve to outline in a practical way the problems which one researcher found with a particular polar dichotomy. Lewis faulted the folk-urban dichotomy for the following problems.

(1) The dichotomy focuses basically on the city as a source of change, hence ignoring or neglecting other change agents. For example, contacts between groups, the influence of the Mexican revolution, or the experience of being conquered.

(2) Additionally, culture change from folk to urban may result from increasing heterogeneity of cultural items. For example, the incorporation of Spanish implements of agriculture acted to encourage a varied rural culture.

(3) Some criteria of the folk society are treated as interdependent when they may well be distinctive traits which operate independently of one another. (For example, Sol Tax's work previously cited showed the lack of supportive ties among Guatemalan Indians.)

(4) The typology tends to obscure the range of life ways of so-called primitives. Likewise, it does not recognize the diversity of urban societies.

(5) The typology has highly selective categories and neglects psychological data.

(6) The folk-urban dichotomy reflects "a system of value judgements which contains the old Rousseauan notion of primitive people as noble savages, and the corollary that with civilization has come the fall of

man" (Lewis, 1951:435).

In turn, Robert Redfield, in his justification of the use of the folk ideal type, noted

> The construction of the type depends indeed upon special knowledge of tribal and peasant groups. The ideal folk society could be defined through assembling in the imagination, the characters which are to be found in the modern city ... The complete procedure requires us to gain acquaintance with many folk societies in many parts of the world, and to set down in words general enough to describe most of them those characteristics which they have in common with each other and which the modern city does not have (Redfield, 1947:294). (Emphasis added)

It is obvious that Redfield assumes that he has adequate knowledge about peasant groups and, in addition to this, verified knowledge about the nature of city life. (Redfield refers, in an article in 1941, to Wirth's 1938 article on the city as reflecting the nature of the opposing urban type. This colleagial reinforcement is interesting given that Wirth, in his 1938 article, refers to his urban type as an ideal type in contrast to the folk type!) One would be led to question, given the various criticisms and empirical questions which were discussed in Chapter Four, whether knowledge of either of these two categories is sufficient, and whether they contain elements which are necessarily in opposition to one another. Many assumptions are in operation here regarding the justification of the procedure and the impact of this procedure.

It was mentioned in Chapter Two that Tonnies had trouble in convincing his critics of the ideal type nature of his polar constructs Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. Louis Wirth, as Tonnies before him, later recognized difficulties in his use of polar constructs and attempted to extricate himself from some of the problems involved in his dichotomy. Wirth notes that his classic 1938 essay "Urbanism as a Way of Life" assumes that the polar opposite of the city is the country. In 1956 he suggested that we need to know the significant comparisons between rural and urban life in order to be certain that we have isolated the unique features of urban life.

> To set up ideal-typical polar concepts such as I have done, and many others before me have done, does not prove that city and country are fundamentally and necessarily different. It does not justify mistaking the hypothetical characteristics attributed to the urban and rural modes of life for established facts, as has so often been done. Rather it suggests certain hypotheses to be tested in the light of empirical evidence which we must assiduously gather. Unfortunately this evidence has not been accumulated in such a fashion as to test critically any major hypothesis that has been proposed (Wirth, 1956:166). (Emphasis added)

Wirth cautions that rural areas differ and the rural-urban dichotomy is, in fact, a trichotomy between rural farm, rural-non-farm, and urban (Wirth, 1956:167). Thus, while Wirth moves in the direction of recognizing problems in the typology, he proposes a trichotomy which still doesn't take into consideration the differences between urban areas and further distinctions which might be made between non-urban areas. However, he goes on to suggest that the even more basic issues may well be questions of density, heterogeneity, and numbers and their impact on people. He suggests the possibility of looking at degrees of a continuum as opposed to urban and rural statistical categories.

These insightful observations by Wirth were first published posthumously in 1956, having been found among his papers after his death in 1951. Hauser credits Wirth with having been quite explicit in recognizing the "limitations of the ideal-type construct as empirical generalizations" (Hauser, 1956b:506). However, the insights in Wirth's above article were not published until 18 years after his original article on the city. The article quoted and re-quoted is Wirth's 1938 "Urbanism as a Way of Life". The wisdom which comes with time may not be the wisdom which is popularly embraced.

The dualistic typology of Tonnies' Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft proved to be cumbersome for him. Durkheim's early distinction between Mechanical and Organic Solidarity was one which evidence suggests (see Chapter Three) he may have later found intellectually discomforting but it has remained as a popularly acclaimed distinctive contribution of the historical Durkheim. Wirth found himself in a quandry regarding the ideal type distinction he attempted to make. Redfield, likewise, had trouble with his folk-urban typology and can be seen as vacillating between viewing it as an ideal type or a type of real society (see Lewis, 1951). The problems which these polar dichotomies presented remain with us. The phraseology of these various polar types remains in use. Attendant with this are some particular and recurring problems which we will detail below.

A. Dichotomous Types Encourage Binary Thought

The type construct in dichotomous form predisposes to the fallacy of "binary thinking". By this term, we refer to a tendency to view reality or a portion thereof in terms of opposing, distinct categories which, not infrequently, carry connotations of good versus evil. While the use of absolutist polarities is usually justified by reference to their heuristic utility, in practice they may so entice the researcher by their orderliness and simplicity that the variations of social life are overlooked. Certainly, when faced with the challenge of predicting human behavior, social scientists are well aware that they are not as yet equipped with understanding so advanced that they may regard social life as orderly and simplistic.

Binary thinking thus encourages two sociologically unproductive side-products, a narrow, rigidified pigeon-holing of social phenomena and evaluative overtones which influence the analysis of those phenomena. However, one may espouse ethical neutrality, the tendency toward the operation of a halo effect has been well documented by social psychologists. The inclination to assume that "good things go together" is particularly noticeable in the operations with polar dichotomies.

B. Polar Typologies May Be Influential Yet Unexplicated

Weber's explication of the ideal type, Tonnies use of it, and recurring appreciation for its organizing and potential sensitizing functions have made sociologists appreciative of its use. However, one problem is that of the implicit ideal type - not explicated. It is convenient, and less complicated to operate in terms of dualisms and these are not always explicated. Too often sociologists, even if they denied setting up an ideal type, have been operating nevertheless with polar typologies, under which are subsumed a set of still to be proved characteristics. Unexplicated typologies fall prey to the same errors as those that are explicated with the addition that they then tend to fall into the category of common sense notions. For example, operating within much of the current writing on urban social relationships is an implicit typology of the "good" versus the "bad" social relationship - such plebian social psychology has acted to impede understanding rather than to facilitate it.

C. Polar Types Encourage Premature Closure

As currently used, polar types act as perceptual blinders by predisposing one to ignore conflicting evidence. Patterns have been set up which limit perception. If some researchers have viewed hypotheses as contaminating one's perception (e.g., Park, 1952) at least sociologists are technically familiar with the null hypothesis (though its use is probably not as frequent as rigorous methodologists would advise). In the case of polar types, researchers operate with few back-up provisions. Although Max Weber used ideal types with illustrious precision and a vast background of historical knowledge, his predecessors have too frequently fumbled.

The method of ideal type application has generally precluded building provisions into the research design which would test for alternative phenomena. Frank Westie (1957), in an article dealing with the development of theoretical explanations, has suggested a procedure for specifying alternative theoretical explanations and then, within a single research project, examining evidence which might fit into alternative explanatory forms. Westie's suggestions, which have the merits both of encouraging efficient research as well as providing a technique for innovative recombinations of theoretical propositions, has received little practical attention. The suggestions which he makes are ones which could well be adapted to polar type constructs and would both decrease their problematic aspects, as well as increase their heuristic utility. If the researcher listed the relationships expected to arise from the typology as well as those phenomena or combinations of traits which would deny the validity or modify the type, he might well be encouraged to sensitize himself to disconfirming evidence. In point of fact, an investigation which does not find or recognize any disconfirming evidence (e.g., all relationships in a small, pre-literate community under study are reported to be close, supportive and intimate), would well suggest that both the methods and methodology of the research need to be seriously re-examined. The research area under discussion might well benefit from an adaptation of Westie's suggested technique.

D. Hypothetical Polar Types Are Not Uncommonly Reified.

Although dichotomous types may be clearly specified by their user as ideal types and their existence in reality disclaimed, there seems to be a tendency toward their hypostatization. Ideal types have frequently been seized upon by appreciative readers and reiterated as products of research instead of constructs intended to guide research. For the researcher, there is likewise a tendency to act upon his own typologies as though, by stating them, they assume some verification and deserve defense against disconfirming evidence (witness Redfield's attempts to handle the data regarding Guatemalan Indians and Lewis' re-study of Tepoztlan in light of his own preferred typologies). For both researcher and reader, the act of creating sometimes seems akin to the act of documentation. This is a particularly salient problem where there is little chance of replication. Much of the research evidence regarding non-urbanized, non-industrialized societies is based on ethnographical evidence. Forty years ago, Radin (1933) referred to the dangers of the field ethnologist assuming a "semidivine" function in his work. His research may be the last analysis, the last authority, and the interpretations rest upon the work of basically one researcher.

Mannheim observed many years ago that "It could be shown in all cases that not only do fundamental orientations, evaluations and the content of ideas differ, but that the manner of stating a problem, the sort of approach made, and even the categories in which experiences are subsumed, collected and ordered, vary according to the social position of the observer" (Mannheim, 1936:13). This well illustrates the intellectual risk in uncritically embracing the preconceived typologies of another social scientist, however eminent.

E. Polar Types Are Implicit Theoretical Formulations.

Polar types may be seen as implicit theoretical formulations. Although they may appear to be simple classificatory schemes, they are, in another sense, skeletal theories which implicitly explain some aspects of social reality. The following diagram may serve to illustrate our argument that within polar type constructs several implicit assumptions are frequently serving to structure an embryonic theoretical framework.

POLAR TYPE ALPHA	POLAR TYPE OMEGA
1	A
2	B
3	C
4	D
5	E

(1) Traits may be assumed to be interrelated. For example, in type construct Alpha, it may be assumed that characteristics 1 through 5 bear a relation to each other. When 2 is present, it is assumed that 3 is also present. Apart from the proposition form which this could take as an assertion, it also gives rise to questions regarding the independence of the traits.

(2) There are often evolutionary assumptions. Type Alpha is assumed to evolve into type Omega. De-evolutionary possibilities may be ignored, for example, Alpha could be followed by Omega and again revert to Alpha.

(3) There are often sequential assumptions within each polar type. For example, in polar type Omega, characteristic A may lead to characteristic B, which leads to characteristic C (e.g., it may be assumed that the division

of labor leads to heterogeneity which leads to fractured social relationships).

(4) There are sequential assumptions regarding the type traits and their polar opposites. For example, the manifestation of Alpha traits 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 historically preceded Omega traits A, B. C, D, and E (e.g., intimacy preceded anonymity, emotionalism preceded intellectuality).

The likelihood of such assumptions operating in the use of polar types calls for their clear explication on the part of the researcher. Merton called for research paradigms as part of an effort to achieve greater precision in scholarly research (Merton, 1957). Paradigms which explicate the assumptions involved in polar type constructs are needed. Polar types, whether conceived of as a handy shorthand summation of the extremes of reality or its idealized version, contain a series of (often tacit) postulates and assumptions which sharply structure our perception and research approach.

Polar distinctions can be viewed according to Bendix and Berger as a methodological device for sensitizing the observer to "the bias inherent in every conceptualization" (Bendix and Berger, 1959:110). Thus opposites may provide what Kenneth Burke has referred to as "perspective by incongruity" for social facts may both hide and reveal. The philosopher, Morris Cohen has described this as the principal of polarity, meaning that all opposites involve one another when applied to an entity. Bendix and Berger agree with Cohen's position by asserting that paired concepts in sociology must be considered together in generating hypotheses (Bendix and Berger, 1959:101). However, physical science recognizes the principle of polarity through the substitution of degrees for a definitive determination of such states as hot or cold. This is a difficult task but of great possible reward. In Cohen's view

> the indetermination and consequent inconclusiveness of metaphysical and a good deal of sociological discussion results from uncritically adhering to simple alternatives instead of resorting to the laborious process of integrating opposite assertions by finding the proper distinctions and qualifications (Cohen, 1953:166).

However, apart from the challenge of coming closer to a standard used by the physical science, polar dichotomies in the social sciences present, as discussed, several potential problems: a) the tendency toward binary thought; b) their casual, unexplicated, use; c) possible problems of premature closure; d) their possible reification; and e) the implicit theoretical framework which may reside in such paired distinctions. These serve to call attention both to their cautious use and their careful explication. In practice, thus far, polar types have proved cumbersome for some of our most eminent social thinkers.